

THE
FULTON LEWIS Jr.
REPORT
ON
THE FUND FOR THE
REPUBLIC

8-4-89 SP81571/28
279639
279638

SPECIAL REPORTS INC.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Foreword

In 18 years of broadcast reporting, I have never known a story with as heavy an impact of public interest as the series on the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic.

Tens of thousands of letters have poured in from the listening audience; tips and clues and bits of information have come from every corner of the country; the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee already has conducted a formal investigation of one phase of it -- the "jury tapping" project in Wichita's Federal Court; the coming Congress unquestionably will conduct not one, but several parallel investigations.

The \$200,000 Herblock project of the Fund for the Republic has been canceled; the Communism Bibliography project of the Foundation has been exposed as highly slanted, and public opinion has forced a revision of it, and a correction of the bias.

It was in early 1953 that I first began work on the story, at the time the 15 million dollar grant by the Ford Foundation to the Fund for the Republic was made. On that occasion, I had several interviews with the head of the Foundation, H. Rowan Gaither Jr., in New York and in Los Angeles, but the actual operation of the Fund for the Republic was not yet underway, and most of the activities of the Ford Foundation were in such infancy that any deductions or conclusions were obviously premature.

This was particularly true, because of the very nature of the faults that subsequently were to come to light, and be embodied in this partial series. The stated aims and purposes of both the Foundation and the Fund are glamorous indeed. The description of the projects are unassailable. It is in the execution of them that the evils arise and thus, until that execution can be examined, dissected and analyzed in the reportorial laboratory, there is no story.

Thus, until the first annual report of the Fund for the Republic was published in August of 1955 (under date of May 1, 1955) there was no available basis for investigation, but once the report was available, it became possible to trace down specific projects, study their performance, and demonstrate the consistent "liberal" slant of the various projects at the final level of public contact.

There still is much to be done on this story; the "Freedom Agenda" program has not been scratched, and neither have most of the Ford Foundation activities. Our present intention is to make them available in a similar later volume, if the material justifies it.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

August 22, 1955

THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC GRANT TO STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The Fund for the Republic, a so-called public service organization, financed by fifteen million dollars from the Ford Foundation, into which you and I shall delve together over this microphone at considerable length and detail in the next weeks to come, has published over the weekend its first annual report to which cursory attention of the press was given, but only cursory. Interesting things in that report were ignored and among them was ignored a grant of \$25,000 to Leland Stanford University of Law in Palo Alto, California, for a so-called "analysis of the testimony of witnesses in proceedings relative to communism". Those are the exact words of the official grant to Leland Stanford.

The study is going to cover ten major named witnesses including Elizabeth Bentley, Paul Crouch, Louis Budenz, Manning Johnson and others who formerly were communists and who turned against the Communist Party. For the information of those who are in charge of a great and ordinarily stable University there on the Pacific Coast, this one was peddled to various universities over the East, particularly Catholic ones, all of whom turned it down on the grounds that it obviously was nothing more than an attempt to discredit those witnesses and thus help the Communist cause. Perhaps it would be well for the fathers of Leland Stanford to look over the past performances and the record of this Fund for the Republic before they make any final commitment. The Fund for the Republic now is trying to find some college to serve as a front and to make a similar investigation of the American Legion and the FBI -- the Federal Bureau of Investigation, no less.

August 23, 1955

THE STANFORD GRANT

Well it developed that my report to you last night about the \$25,000 grant by the Fund for the Republic to the Leland Stanford University Law School for another of the Foundation's propaganda projects against Communist investigations and security restrictions by the Federal Government, has stirred up some excitement among the guiding fathers of that institution and I hope it's nothing trivial. You and I are going very carefully and thoroughly into this Fund for the Republic because from all indications to date this is nothing more than an ill-disguised tax free slush fund of 15 million dollars of money that really belongs to us, the public, dedicated to the fighting of any and all attempts to ferret out Communist intrigues and espionage agents and activities -- and to propagandize the Federal Courts throughout the country into the concept that it is a violation of the civil rights of an individual for the government to inquire into his Communist connections and activities even if he is an employee of the Federal Government. So I guess we might as well begin with a little background on the organization so you'll know how it came into existence and why, and then go on from there.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

The Fund for the Republic, incidentally, has just made public its first annual report, although it has been in business for at least 3 or 4 years, which in itself is a rather questionable operating procedure for an organization enjoying tax exemption on the grounds that it is a public service organization. If this outfit is operating in the interests of all the people of the United States, I am the King of Siam. The fact is that it's an extreme, ideological, political propaganda organization, promoting the doctrines of the Americans for Democratic Action and all points to the left of that, fighting the security programs by which the Federal Government tries to protect itself against enemy infiltration, fighting also the Congressional investigations who seek to expose Communism, and the methods the Communists have used in the past to infiltrate our government up to the very highest levels -- fighting in fact to discredit those former Communists who have had the courage to renounce Communism and come forward and tell their own experiences and thus expose others, some of whom are still in high places. That is the net end to which the operations of the Fund for the Republic activities to date are directed and I think it's time that they be exposed to you, the people of the United States, and I propose to do exactly that.

The original grant of 15 million dollars under which the Fund operates was given by the Ford Foundation which constitutes the bulk of the fortunes of the late Henry and Edsel Ford -- and by way of preferring to be generous about the matter, I prefer to believe that the grant was an act in a weak and unthinking moment. However, 15 million dollars is quite a piece of change to be throwing around in weak and unthinking moments and this one was a serious wild pitch. It originally was the brain child of one Paul Hoffman, the dilettante left-winger who for some disturbing reason or another, seems to have a definite influence at the present White House -- through side windows -- and the common information in Detroit in quarters close to the Ford family is that the Fund for the Republic was set up really to provide a spot in which to put Paul Hoffman -- at a salary of 75 thousand dollars a year -- in order to ease him out of the directorate or the trustee board or whatever you wish to call it, of the Ford Foundation itself.

In any event, Mr. Hoffman became the first President of the Fund for the Republic, remained such for a considerable period of time, until he went back into the automobile manufacturing business with Studebaker. When he did so he bestowed his 75 thousand dollar a year mantle on the now Senator Clifford Case of New Jersey, whose election campaign last year stirred up such a furor because of his own extreme left-wing record as a member of the House of Representatives and because of the reported Communist connections of his sister Adelaide Case, which connections he attempted to make the public believe were just a case of mistaken identity. When Clifford Case was finally elected to the Senate by the narrowest sort of a squeak in a heavy Republican state, he running on the Republican ticket, the Fund for the Republic presidency went to one of the most renowned radicals of the American educational world, the former President of the University of Chicago -- Robert M. Hutchins, who now holds the post.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Now comes this first annual report and the announcement about the 25 thousand dollar fund to the Law School of Leland Stanford for a so-called study of the testimony of the individuals who formerly were members, or agents of the Communist Party and who since have reformed and testified against it -- Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz and the rest.

This study is to be conducted, if you please, by a man by the name of Herbert Packer, who presently is an employee in the Washington office of -- guess what -- the Fund for the Republic. He is scheduled, however, to join the faculty of the Leland Stanford University Law School about the first of January and will go on with the study from there.

Study -- my grandmother!

August 24, 1955

A VISIT TO FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC HEADQUARTERS

About our studies into the fifteen million dollar "Fund for the Republic", I've had an interesting personal experience this afternoon; as a reporter, I went to the headquarters of the Fund for the Republic on the fifty-fifth floor of the Lincoln Building here, at number 60 East Forty-second Street, to pick up what literature was available including some additional copies of this first annual report, which has just been made public, and was forthwith summoned -- after disclosing my identity -- into an office where the vice-president of the Fund, W. H. Ferry, was ensconced behind a desk, with the additional presence of the secretary & treasurer, Mr. David F. Freeman.

Behind me was placed a lady who took down the interview in shorthand, although I was not asked whether this was acceptable to me and, in fact, the only way I knew she was taking the interview was that I happened to turn, and thus saw what she was doing.

Mr. Ferry is a swarthy-complexioned man of medium build -- I should say about 40 years old -- and he sat with both feet on the top of his desk, a short distance from my face. Mr. Freeman, somewhat taller and rather a blonde type, sat in more conventional posture, with his feet on the floor.

Mr. Ferry was quite vigorous in his criticism of the report which I made to you last night, and on several occasions impugned the integrity of my reporting and, in fact, the honesty of my intentions. He said that he couldn't understand why I should want the documents I have picked up, because they contained fact, and I would not be interested in fact.

He said that my report of last night -- which he had heard over his radio -- contained a false statement about the salary that was paid to Paul Hoffman, the first head of the Fund for the Republic. He complained that I said that Paul Hoffman was president of the Fund, when in fact he was chairman of the board of directors, and that therefore, he never received any salary as president.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

I accepted this amendment, and promised to pass on to you the correction, which I am now doing. Mr. Ferry admitted, however, that Mr. Hoffman did receive a salary as a member of the board of directors, as did the other board members, the figure, I believe being \$3,000 a year.

Mr. Ferry also admitted that the now Senator Clifford Case of New Jersey, did become president of the Fund for the Republic in May of 1953, and held that job until he resigned on April 1, 1954, and that he was succeeded at that time by Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, formerly the highly controversial president of the University of Chicago. I asked what the salaries were for those two individuals and both Mr. Ferry and Mr. Freeman refused to tell me. They said that I would have to get that information from Senator Case and from Dr. Hutchins, because the personal income of those individuals was their own affair.

I replied that I could not agree with that point of view, inasmuch as the money at the disposal of the Fund for the Republic -- the 15 million dollars granted by the Ford Foundation -- is the property of the general public, including myself, and that therefore, it appears obvious to me that the general public is entitled to know how it is being spent, and how much is being paid to the various officers, particularly. They failed to agree on this point, however, and I finally noted that it doesn't make too much difference anyway, because there are plenty of ways I can find out, and I shall certainly do so.

The figure that I gave you last night, as generally reported information, was 75 thousand dollars a year. From information which I have gathered since, however, the indications are that it is about forty thousand a year. I'll have the figure for you definitely, however, in a very short time. The only importance of the refusal of Messrs. Ferry and Freeman to give me the information today was a point of principle; the question of whether I am right, in my argument that this money belongs to the general public at large, and thus the general public has a right to know how it's spent. They say no. I say yes. And the important fact is that this money is tax free... and if the money does belong to the entire public, should the Bureau of Internal Revenue continue to grant it that freedom from taxation. For obvious reasons, I have written Mr. Ferry a letter, which reads as follows:

"Dear Mr. Ferry: In view of the fact that you saw fit to have two witnesses present at our meeting today, one of whom was taking a stenographic record, I shall expect of course, a certified copy of that transcript for my own records. Please send the transcript, registered mail to my office in the Heurich Building, 1627 K Street, Washington 6, D. C. as soon as possible. Very truly yours!"

Now, we also had some discussions this afternoon about the grant of 25 thousand dollars to the Leland Stanford University Law School, in Palo Alto, California, for a so-called "study" of the testimony of such former communists as Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz, Paul Crouch, and -- I assume -- Whittaker Chambers and the rest... the official listing of this project, in the annual

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

report, says "For an analysis of testimony of witnesses in proceedings relative to communism". The allocation was made at the May meeting of the directors of the Fund for the Republic, and at the same time an additional allocation of 5 thousand dollars was made to the same institution, "to finance a summer study on a civil liberties topic by members of the Stanford Law Review." Just what the Civil Liberties topic was, is not disclosed, nor was I provided with any information as to what the results of the study were.

On the matter of the 25 thousand dollar grant, however, there were interesting developments. By means of various long distance telephone inquiries since last night, I have now developed the fact that Mr. Herbert Packer, who is going to do this Communist testimony survey, is NOT -- as I first reported to you -- employed in the Washington office of the Fund for the Republic, for the simple reason that there is no Washington office. However, it is a fact, and this was admitted to me today by Messrs. Ferry and Freeman, that Mr. Packer was employed on the payroll of the Foundation as a consultant on a project called "Case Studies in Personnel Security", receiving approximately 700 hundred dollars for those part time services, and in the report of those studies, just made public -- it is dated August 1955 -- this month -- his name is listed as one of four members of the "advisory committee". The director of the project expresses particular gratitude to Mr. Packer, in the foreword of the final report, which is some 310 pages long.

It consists of a symposium of the stories of individuals and their attorneys, in security cases on the part of government employees, although it admittedly does not contain the government's side of the story.

Now, the one big question mark in this whole Leland Stanford University project for so-called analysis of testimony in cases concerning Communism, is this:

Just why should an institution, as distinguished and irreproachable as Leland Stanford University, be allowing an outside individual to come in and assume the dignity and prestige of becoming a member of its faculty, in order to make such a study as this one, and why was it necessary to involve the University at all, under the circumstances?

If the Fund for the Republic wants that study made, why not just make the allocation to Mr. Herbert Packer, and forget the window-dressing? Or, if the Fund wants the University to make the survey, why is it necessary to send the Fund's own Mr. Packer out to Palo Alto, and have him attached to the faculty to do the surveying? If the law faculty of Leland Stanford is to lend its prestige to the report, then it would seem reasonable to expect that the regular law faculty would do the job. If not, Mr. Packer could do the job just as well in his law office in Washington, D. C., where much more documentary information is available than is available in Palo Alto, California.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

The further question seems to arise, just what was the timing of this arrangement by which Mr. Packer was to join the Leland Stanford faculty? Did the chicken come first or was it the egg? Did the University of its own volition, seek Mr. Packer out, of all the attorneys, hundreds of thousands of them in the nation, and invite him to teach at the University, or did it agree to accept him on the faculty for the real purpose of making the survey?

And just how did this whole project arise in the beginning, anyhow; and who decided to approve it, on the part of the University?

I contacted one member of the Board of Trustees of the University in San Francisco last night, and he informed me that he was very sure that the Board of Trustees had not approved it, and he did not believe it had even been presented to the board.

Messrs. Ferry and Freeman informed me this afternoon that all arrangements were made by the Fund for The Republic with the Dean of the Law School, Dr. Carl B. Spaeth.

I have been trying for the last two and a half hours to reach Dr. Spaeth, to get his version of the matter, leaving word that I would like to talk to him before the time of this broadcast, and as yet I have received no reply from him.

That about tells the story of today's reporting. . . . I'll have more for you tomorrow night, of course -- including some of my personal experiences with these so-called "studies" which the Fund for the Republic is financing -- and how they are handled.

One thing more -- Mr. Ferry called my attention this afternoon to the fact that this first annual report was made on the first anniversary of the date on which Dr. Robert Hutchins took over as President. This was apropos of my remarks last night, regarding the odd fact that the first annual report comes not at the end of the first year, but at the end of about 2 -1/2 years. Whether that's an explanation or not, I leave to you. Mr. Ferry did not explain why there have been no annual reports prior to the time Dr. Hutchins came in.

August 25, 1955

MR. W. H. (PING) FERRY

I reported to you last night on an interview I had with the vice-president of the Fund in New York City, W. H. Ferry and his belligerent attitude, and inasmuch as he seems to be sharing the direction of the operation with Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, the former president of the University of Chicago, it seemed to me to be the indicated course, to find out something more about him.

Inasmuch as he comes from Detroit, Michigan, the trail therefore seemed to lead there, and therefore I came here to Detroit overnight from New York, and

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

went to work.

Young Mr. Ferry is the son of a distinguished and conservative Detroit industrialist, Hugh Ferry, former President and Chairman of the Board of the Packard Motor Company, and after getting through college he held jobs on a few small newspapers and finally worked as a reporter on the Detroit Times for two or three years. Newspaper men who worked with him say he was an acceptable run-of-the-mine routine reporter, but definitely not any inspired genius. From here, it seems, he went to New York and got a job for awhile with a public relations firm, and during this period he worked for some time for the CIO Political Action Committee, under the late Sidney Hillman. That may account for considerable. It seems further that he was assigned to Henry Ford the Second as a personal public relations man, and in that connection had contact with the Ford Foundation, through which he got into the Fund for the Republic, which operates on a 15 million dollar grant from the Ford Foundation. In that connection, I think it's only fair to point out, very specifically, that neither the Ford Motor Company, nor the Ford Foundation have any control whatsoever over the policies and activities of the Fund for the Republic. This 15 million dollars was an outright grant, with no strings attached, and the Fund for the Republic is completely self-autonomous. Ferry's general reputation among his former colleagues here is that he was a constant dissenter and rebel against everything conventional.

His background with the CIO Political Action Committee is important because the policies and approaches of that organization are, of course, virtually identical with those of the Americans for Democratic Action, and the generally accepted appraisal is that the two are Siamese twins, and between them have taken over control of the Democratic Party as now constituted. They dictate the policy line of the so-called Northern wing of the Democratic Party, and the Northern wing has operating and policy control of the party as a whole.

And, with this 15 million dollars of tax exempt money, Mr. Ferry sits in his ivory tower in New York and dispenses grants to various projects -- all of which seem strangely reflective of the political views and projects and policies of the CIO, its Political Action Committee and the Americans for Democratic Action.

Now let me read to you from this annual report of the Fund for the Republic, over the signature of President Robert M. Hutchins, as to some of the activities in which it has indulged to date. Under the heading, distribution of books, articles and other material, are the following:

"Banned Books" by Anne Lyon Haight, a book, 275 copies distributed as of May 31st, 1955, to librarians and library trustees.

"Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," special issue on loyalty-security, 25 thousand copies distributed to a list selected by the publisher...note that line,

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"selected by the publisher". For your information, the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" is a publication, the editorial or policy head of which is Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, and this entire edition was devoted to a defense and glorification of Dr. Oppenheimer and a series of attacks on government loyalty and security programs.

Cornell Series in Civil Liberties.....books.....it doesn't say how many, published by the Cornell University Press, and distributed to personnel of the Fund for the Republic.

"Faceless Informers and Our Schools", by Lawrence Martin, a pamphlet, of which 25 thousand copies were distributed to State School Board Associations.

Freedom Award speeches, a pamphlet published by Freedom House, 600 copies, distributed through the National Civil Liberties Clearing House.

(I'm not selecting these, by the way, but rather, I'm reading right down the list, just as they come.)

"Government by Investigation", by Alan Barth, 850 copies, distributed to members of the Federal Bench.

"Open Occupancy Housing", article.....House and Home.....15 thousand copies, sent to National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing; and to others in Race Relations Field.

"See It Now", Edward R. Murrow-Oppenheimer Interview, 110 sixteen millimeter prints, sent to educational institutions, civic organizations, local discussion groups. This, of course, was the Murrow television interview with Oppenheimer, as a super-glamorization and glorification of Oppenheimer after he had been stripped of his security clearance by a special review board of the Atomic Energy Commission.

"See It Now" (again).....Television program on book censorship in California.....5 sixteen millimeter prints, distributed to Southern California Civic Groups. This is the one on which I reported to you previously, in which Murrow attempted to discredit a Mrs. Ann Smart of Marin County, California, for conducting a campaign to eliminate certain nauseatingly lewd and pornographic books, and others that were little short of seditious, from the high school libraries of her community. I had the books read by members of my staff, and some of them would turn your stomach with their filth.

"Strong In Their Pride and Free".....by Harry P. Cain.....speech.....3 thousand copies.....National Civil Liberties Clearing House.

"The Fifth Amendment Today".....by Irwin N. Griswold, book....35 thousand copies....distributed to the American bench and bar. Griswold is Dean

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

of the Harvard University Law School, and one of the most controversial so-called liberals in the American legal profession.

"The Kept Witnesses", by Richard H. Rovere, Harpers.....25 thousand copies, sent to Labor officials and business executives.

"The Pseudo Conservative Revolt", by Richard Hoffstadter.....article..... American Scholar.....25 thousand copies.....sent to business executives, educators and churchmen.

"To Insure The End Of Our Hysteria".....by Paul G. Hoffman.....the New York Times Magazine, 10 thousand copies.....Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, American Dental Association.

"To Make Our Security System Secure".....by Vannevar Bush.....article..... The New York Times Magazine, 10 thousand copies to educators.

"Who Collaborated With Russia?".....by Paul Willen.....article.....Anti-och Review....600 copies....to the National Civil Liberties Clearing House.

And in the body of Dr. Hutchins report is the following paragraph, which I feel sure will be of interest to Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield:

"The authority of the Post Office Department to interfere with freedom of expression is very great, and the Department has lately shown a disposition to exercise it. The Fund for the Republic believes that an objective analysis of the powers and conduct of the Department, with reference to freedom of expression, is called for. The fund has undertaken to finance a study of this subject."

The allocation for this project is listed in the financial report at 35 thousand dollars.

I might add that the report discloses that an appropriation of 200 thousand dollars has been made to finance a nationwide series of television programs this Fall, by the cartoonist of the left-wing Washington Post -- Herbert Block, who draws under the pen name, "Herblock".

And all this on tax exempt money which belongs to you and to the rest of the people of the nation.

Please note in all I have read to you, from these projects of the Fund for the Republic, there is not one penny for anything to benefit the farmers of the nation, the man and his wife who run the corner grocery store and provide jobs for a couple of other neighbors.....nothing about bringing up healthier kids, or better education, or better salaries for school teachers and policemen and postmen.....just the same old lines of agitation from the policy book of the CIO Political Action Committee and the Americans for Democratic Action. And

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

this is supposed to be strictly non-political activity in the interest of the whole general public.

August 26, 1955

FURTHER DEVELOPMENTS RE.
THE FUND'S STANFORD GRANT

I have further developments to report regarding the newly announced 25 thousand dollar grant to the Law School of Leland Stanford University in California, for the so-called survey of "testimony of witnesses in proceedings relative to communism".

That is the case in which a young man by the name of Herbert Packer, who presently is attached to a law firm here in Washington although he is not even a member of the District of Columbia Bar, is to become a member of the Leland Stanford Law Faculty as of the first of this year, to conduct this survey. Actually, Herbert Packer has been in the employment of the Fund for the Republic, working on another project entitled "Case Studies in Personnel Security" for some months past, so this is not Leland Stanford University doing this job at all; the so-called "study" is merely being dignified by the good name of Leland Stanford.

It is a project that has been peddled around to various universities, including Georgetown University here in Washington, D. C., which would have no part of it. The obvious objective of the survey, of course, is to try to pick inconsistencies or contradictions or flaws in the testimony that has been given by the various anti-communist witnesses at various times before various committees, with a view to discrediting that testimony and those who gave it.

You will note please, that the great crusading Fund for the Republic appropriated no hundreds of thousands for a study of the testimony of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, in the special security hearings before the Atomic Energy Commission. Instead, they appropriated 200 thousand dollars to make and distribute free film reprints of the Edward R. Murrow television program, which attempted to whitewash and glamorize Dr. Oppenheimer after the Security Board had ruled against him, and cancelled his security clearance.

Please note also that there is no appropriation to inquire into the motives and purposes of the people who wrote the vile and filthy and actually seditious books that were on the shelves of high school libraries in California, but that it did appropriate money to make and distribute copy-prints of another Murrow program, in which he attempted to discredit and hold up to ridicule the California housewife and mother who conducted a campaign to have those books removed -- and succeeded in getting them removed. This, to the Fund for the Republic is book-burning, and a heinous evil.

Please note that nowhere, in all of the projects that have been undertaken, is

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

there any appropriation for a project to find something good about American freedom and standards of living and the right of a man to improve himself and his family by hard work; but there is an appropriation of 200 thousand dollars for the cartoonist of the very leftist Washington Post -- which championed Alger Hiss and William Remington and decries security investigations and restrictions regarding government employees -- there is an appropriation of 200 thousand dollars for that cartoonist, Herblock, to do a nationwide television propaganda program, this Fall and Winter.

There is no appropriation for the American Legion, for example, to do a television program, perhaps, on constructive Americanism, and how it affects the rights of the individual, and how those rights should be safeguarded. but there is, I am informed a project under consideration to investigate both the American Legion and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the grounds that they endanger personal rights and freedoms of the individual.

There is also, (and I'm reading from their own list of announced projects now) an appropriation of 150 thousand dollars (and remember, all of this is your money. it belongs to all of the American people including you and me). 150 thousand dollars of your money for a project entitled "Fear in Education" a study of attitudes of college and high school teachers".

Also an appropriation for a study of blacklisting in private industry. a study of blacklisting in the motion picture, radio and television industries. And so it goes. And so the 25 thousand dollars goes to this purported study of testimony of witnesses in Communist proceedings, by Leland Stanford University.

Now, night before last, I reported to you that I then had been trying for two and a half hours to reach, by long distance telephone, the Dean of the Stanford University Law School who, according to officials of the Fund for the Republic in New York, had made the arrangements for the appropriation. There were certain very specific questions I wanted to ask, inasmuch as I knew at the time that this project had been turned down by Georgetown University here. Among them was the little point of who broached the subject of this study? Was it the brainchild of the Stanford Dean -- Carl Spaeth -- himself? Or was the project offered to him?

How did this Herbert Packer get into the picture -- a 36 year old Washington lawyer who is not even a member of the District of Columbia Bar? What qualifies him to be making this survey? And what is his objective in making it, anyway? What legitimate end does he expect the survey to serve?

Is Packer being attached to the Leland Stanford faculty for the purpose of making this survey, and if so, why? If the Leland Stanford name is to go on the report, why doesn't the regular law faculty of the University make the survey?

Did the Board of Trustees of the University pass on this project and if not,

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

why not?

And, in the light of the facts that now have been exposed, does Dean Spaeth intend to reconsider the project and take a second look?

It was day before yesterday when I made the first calls to Dean Spaeth. His office staff said he would return in about 30 minutes. I replaced the call this afternoon, but he could not be located. I again left word for him to call me at my expense, but I have heard nothing from him.

Perhaps a little background on Dr. Spaeth would be helpful. Through the war years he was with the State Department in various capacities; he was a member of the U.S. delegation to the 11th conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations at Lucknow, India, in 1949; he has been director of the division of overseas activities of the Ford Foundation since 1952, many of the works of which -- rightfully or wrongfully -- have been widely criticized.

By Monday, I hope to have considerably more on his background, and I also hope that he will have answered my telephone inquiry.

What do you think of all this?

All of this stuff is the straight political party line of the CIO Political Action Committee for which Mr. W. H. Ferry, the really active figure in the Fund for the Republic, worked for a considerable time, under Sidney Hillman. It is the straight political party line of the Americans for Democratic Action, which is looking eagerly toward the Presidential election year, coming up.

And behind it is 15 million dollars of tax exempt money, to finance the operation. I think our next move is to ask the Treasury Department and the Bureau of Internal Revenue some questions.

August 29, 1955

ROBERT MAYNARD HUTCHINS

I think the next indicated course is to examine the people who control the distribution of this money. . . . the people who decide how much is to be given to whom and to what organizations. . . . and I think the logical person to begin with is the President of the Fund who -- after all -- is primarily responsible, and who has the real, practical control. In the selective process, his views and policies are going to be highly reflected in the disposition of funds.

This individual is Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, one-time boy-wonder chancellor of the University of Chicago who, from the time he took over that position in 1929 at the age of 30, has been one of the most controversial and highly criticized figures in the world of American education.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

He had very violently progressive ideas -- verging on the revolutionary -- and began having conflicts with his faculty from the time he took over in Chicago, and it finally reached the point at which the Faculty Senate of the University adopted an unprecedented resolution of censure against him. By 1951, public criticism and criticism from alumni had reached such a high pressure, and the financial condition of the University -- which was very good when he came there -- had become so critical, and the enrollment so inadequate, that he resigned voluntarily, and became an associate director of the Ford Foundation, which was just then being set up. He was fed up with the unhappy job of trying to solicit money to keep the University going. . . . from here on, he was to have a hand in giving some of it away. The Ford Foundation, after all, amounts to about one-half billion dollars, and that's something worth getting into.

In early 1953, the Foundation appropriated 15 million dollars for this Fund for the Republic, and in 1954, Mr. Hutchins became President of the Fund and a member of the Board of Directors, at a reputed salary of 40 thousand dollars. The headquarters of the Fund will not reveal what the salary is, but that is the reputed amount.

Now, the safest way to reflect the thinking and the ideology of any individual, is to let the individual tell his own story, and over the weekend I have compiled a sort of bibliography on Robert Maynard Hutchins, being careful to keep the items well up to date, as you will see. And here are some of the items at hand. To begin with, back in 1949, the Illinois State Legislature set up a special commission to investigate Communist activities on the University campus, and on April 20th, 1949, the commission cross-examined Dr. Hutchins. He said he did not believe that communism is "a clear and present danger"; he was not convinced that Communist fronts were part of the Communist movement; that there was a Communist club on the campus, but so far as the purposes were concerned he believed that the members just wanted to study communism, theoretically. He thought there were 10 or 11 members of the club; the largest meeting he had ever heard of was 7; later testimony however showed that 6 weeks prior to Dr. Hutchins' testimony, an actual count at one meeting showed 36 people present. He was asked whether he had any doubts that the Communist Party is a subversive organization, and his reply was: "I cannot believe that is true (in this country) or the Communist Party would long since be illegal."

Now let me quote from the DAILY WORKER for Friday July 7, 1950, page four, columns one and two; a story from the University of Southern California, where 157 college employees had been severed from the payroll for refusing to sign a non-communist loyalty oath; this is an interview with Dr. Hutchins:

"Hutchins said the regents action was a 'serious indictment of the board of regents' and especially Dr. Sproul, the president (who supported the cleanout.) It actually questions his fortitude and certainly it questions his qualifications to head a great university. The University of California is a great institution, but

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

at this rate, it won't be, long."

Also, the DAILY WORKER, June 25, 1951 -- the headline:

"Ford Foundation head joins blast at high cost (Court) of OK for Smith Act." And this story actually is an attack on the Supreme Court decision, convicting the 11 Communist leaders. It quotes Dr. Hutchins as saying that the decision "indicates that we are last up against a great crisis in this country". He said, "It's a new day and a new Supreme Court." He then went on to state: "It may now become more difficult for us to take some of the positions we have in the past." He then reminds the group to which he was speaking that he was always willing to hire Communists to be college professors, and had not changed. Then he added:

"We may even have to decide whether we must violate the law, in order to remain in conformity with our convictions."

Now, the WASHINGTON POST, June 12, 1953, page four, an Associated Press dispatch from Pasadena, California, as follows:

"Dr. Robert M. Hutchins of the Ford Foundation, today branded the California State Senate Investigating Committee on Education as 'subversive and un-American' and urged its repudiation.

"Dr. Hutchins, associate director of the Ford Foundation and former chancellor of the University of Chicago, was mentioned in the Committee's 11th report, entitled 'Opposition to loyalty', because of his former connection with the Great Books Foundation.

"Declaring that the Senate Committee is now in the very forefront of subversive and unAmerican organizations, Dr. Hutchins wrote: 'Never before, so far as I know, has an official agency explicitly attacked freedom of thought and freedom of speech.'"

December 15, 1952. The PEOPLES' DAILY WORLD, which is the West Coast edition of the New York DAILY WORKER:

"The academic profession is already petrified -- nearly frightened to death -- but with reason. The professor in a dairying state who was dismissed for saying a good word for oleomargarine is an example," he said.

"Hutchins predicted that if educators are beaten into conformity by the un-Americans, then newspaper men and journalists will most likely be next, because, he said, 'the daily comic strips wield a greater influence on the young than the educator.' Mothers who are supposed to mold childish character, will probably have to take loyalty oaths, too, he added dryly."

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Wednesday, December 9, 1952, also the PEOPLES' DAILY WORLD. Beverly Hills, California dateline:

"Dr. Hutchins defined the wave of spy hysteria in the United States as one of nervous shock. 'Ours is one of the few countries in which a Communist cannot teach or hold a government position', he said.

"Today, we are cursed by a tremendous glorification of the FBI. The only people we will believe are confessed spies and traitors.

"The Attorney General now proposes to evade the Fifth Amendment and to permit the use of evidence obtained illegally by wire-tapping."

He then said that Attorney General Brownell was a student at Yale University Law School when he was a teacher there, and he hopes that Brownell was not in any of his classes.

"Dr. Hutchins suggested that all limitations on Communists be removed. 'I would catch and punish criminals', he said, 'I would not condemn a man because he belonged to an organization. The Communist Party may be in the hands of the Kremlin, but it does not follow that everyone in the Communist Party is a part of a conspiracy. I do not believe that spying accelerated by thirty days the development of the atom bomb in Russia.'"

Now this, you understand, is the man who has 15 million dollars of tax free money -- money that belongs to you and me and all of the rest of the American people -- to give away according to his own judgment of what is in the public interest.

And these are his own statements; you appraise them for yourself.

August 30, 1955

DEAN CARL B. SPAETH AND
THE FUND'S GRANT TO STANFORD

Inasmuch as we dealt last night with Mr. Hutchins himself, let's take up, tonight, the Dean of the Stanford University School of Law in California, to which The Fund for the Republic has just given a 25 thousand dollar grant for a study of the testimony of witnesses, in proceedings concerning Communism.

That is the one in which a young attorney by the name of Herbert Packer, who has been on the payroll of the Fund for the Republic on another project for some months past, is to be sent to California, and attached to the Stanford University Law Faculty, to direct this so-called study. In view of the very peculiar circumstances surrounding the project, and the fact that I have been trying for nearly a week now, to get hold of the Dean of that Law School, Dean Carl B. Spaeth -- without success -- and in view of the fact that the Fund for the Re-

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

public says that they made the contract for this grant directly with Dean Spaeth, the next indicated subject of inspection would seem to be Dean Carl B. Spaeth.

It seems that Dean Spaeth is 48 years old, and was a classmate of Nelson Rockefeller at Dartmouth, in the class of 1929. . . . later went to Oxford on a Rhodes Scholarship, where he got a degree of Bachelor of Civil Laws. So far as the records indicate, he never received any regular American Law degree, but he taught law at Temple University in Philadelphia in 1933 and 1934, and then went to Chicago, where he became an assistant professor of law at Northwestern University. While he was in Chicago he became acquainted with one Adlai Stevenson, who then was a young attorney around the town.

At the beginning of World War II, he moved into Washington, and became a sort of protege of Nelson Rockefeller, who seemed to take him under his wing, and became also a great friend of the Alger Hiss, Lawrence Duggan, Sumner Welles clique in the Department -- the anti-Cordell Hull clique.

He remained in the Department until the end of 1946, and for the last year was one of three special assistants to the Assistant Secretary of State for American Republics Affairs, who was then the highly controversial Spruille Braden. One of his two office mates was an inconspicuous individual who seems to have disappeared from State Department ranks, named James Wright. The other was Gustavo Duran, who figured very prominently in Senator McCarthy's expose of Communists in the State Department. . . . you probably will remember the incident. . . . he was the individual who had been a member of the Communist Party in the Spanish Civil War, and Senator McCarthy had a picture of him in his Communist uniform, and frequently displayed the picture in platform speeches.

So, in those last days in the State Department, Gustavo Duran and Carl Spaeth were office mates.

In 1946, he left the State Department to accept the position of Dean of the Stanford Law School, and has been there ever since, although his biography in "Who's Who" says that he has been on leave of absence since 1952, serving as director of Far Eastern Affairs for the Ford Foundation. If that is true at the present time, it seems a little puzzling that a Dean on leave of absence should have the authority to make a contract of this kind, without even asking the approval of the University's Board of Trustees, but of course I cannot say for sure that he still IS on leave of absence because I cannot get him to answer on the telephone.

Dean Spaeth was in, up to his neck, in the notorious Institute of Pacific Relations, and was a member of the American delegation to an international conference of that organization several years ago.

Members of the Stanford Law Faculty report that he has a habit of boasting

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

that "Adlai confided this or that to me when I saw him in Libertyville, a year ago", and he makes a great profession of his close association and friendship with Adlai Stevenson.

He also made a great profession of his friendship with Alger Hiss, for whom he gave a cocktail party, I am told, in San Francisco shortly after the war..... my informant thinks that it was at the time of the United Nations Conference there, in 1945, but was not absolutely sure. In any event, Hiss himself corroborates the acquaintance. During the hearings of the House UnAmerican Activities Committee, in August of 1948, when Hiss was on the witness stand being cross examined about the testimony of Whittaker Chambers, the following conversation took place -- and I am now reading from the official record of those hearings:

"Mr. Nixon: As you probably noted from press accounts of the hearings, Whittaker Chambers, during the period that he alleges that he knew you, was not known by the name of Whittaker Chambers. He has testified that he was known by the name of Carl. Do you recall having known an individual between the years 1934 and 1937, whose name was Carl?

"Mr. Hiss: I do not recall anyone by the name of Carl that could remotely be connected with the kind of testimony Mr. Chambers has given. I think I know two or three people named Carl -- one of whom I certainly knew..... I would think, as far back as 1937..... Carl Spaeth. I don't at the moment think of anyone else by the name of Carl, whom I knew as far back as that. I know another man named Carl whom I have known more recently.

"Mr. Nixon: You knew them as well by their last names?

"Mr. Hiss: That is right."

Now this same record shows another mention of Dr. Spaeth, during his State Department days....in the testimony of one Robert T. Miller, one of the subordinate officials of the Department, who was described in the Congressional Record as being a known Communist and who, therefore, was being interrogated by the House UnAmerican Activities Committee. The Committee was trying to find out how he ever got into the State Department at all, and here is the testimony -- and again I am reading from the official record:

"Mr. Mundt (Now Senator Mundt and then a member of the House UnAmerican Activities Committee): Who, specifically, approached you -- Mr. Fahy or Nelson Rockefeller, or who?

"Mr. Miller: Well, through Mr. Fahy, I met Nelson Rockefeller, Carl B. Spaeth, and Hadley Cantrill, and a number of other people and I discussed coming down there with ALL of them, and I finally did."

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Dean Spaeth was a very vocal defender of Phillip Jessup, at the time he was under investigation, wrote letters to that effect to the "San Francisco News" on December 17, 1949, and the "San Francisco Chronicle" of June 1950.

He is a great enthusiast on India, and wants to devote 600 thousand dollars of another direct grant from the Ford Foundation, to a study of constitutional and legal problems in India. Incidentally, sometime I'll get around to detailing for you what this man has spent, of Ford Foundation money, in India in the last two years, with a list of the projects. But you'd better take a good sedative first.

Anyway, that's the story of Dean Carl B. Spaeth of the Stanford University School of Law, who has just received the 25 thousand dollar grant from the Fund for the Republic, to make a study of the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz, Paul Crouch, Whittaker Chambers and other reformed Communists, who have come forward and told their stories.

And it's your money, of course -- because it is tax exempt and the sole grounds that it is tax exempt is that it is being used for the benefit of the general public at large. Or do you think that's entirely true, in this case? How do you think this project will turn out, finally?

August 31, 1955

A STUDY OF BLACKLISTING

This is something of an off-day, in our studies of the Fund for the Republic, because I'm in the course of tracing down some leads, many of which have come in from you good listeners by mail. . . . I have attempted to contact Mr. Herbert Packer, the 37 year old lawyer here in Washington, who is assigned by the Fund for the Republic to conduct the survey and study of the testimony of reformed Communist witnesses, and strolled over to his office, just one block from my own, to try to interview him. I wanted to inquire as to just how it happens that he is going to be attached to the faculty of the Stanford University Law School in January, for the purpose of making this survey, and whether he thinks he is capable of doing a legitimate and objective job, in the light of the fact that he is not an employee of the University at all, but rather of the decidedly slanted Fund for the Republic, run by individuals who, by their own statements, are decidedly against loyalty and security investigations and all investigations of Communism and subversive activities generally; also, the fact that he himself is just through with another such investigation -- a selected compilation of the complainants side of the story in some several hundred government personnel security cases.

Unfortunately, I was informed that Mr. Herbert Packer is on vacation. . . . that beginning today, he is in California and will be there for about a week. The fact is, the reason for his presence in California is to confer with Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, the president of the Fund for the Republic, and with Dr. Carl B. Spaeth, the Dean of the Stanford Law School in question, about the

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

coming project.

There is one document here which I think you probably will find of interest a questionnaire which is being sent out by one of the projects of the Fund, this one being entitled "Blacklisting in Private Industry..... a study of blacklisting in the motion picture, radio and television industries"..... an appropriation of 100 thousand dollars, authorized just a year ago.

"1. Does your organization hold that certain political criteria should be met by artists whom you engage, i. e. would you disapprove of hiring an artist

"(a) named as a communist by a government agency?

"(b) one who was an 'unfriendly witness' before a governmental investigating body?

"(c) one who stood on the Fifth Amendment before such a body?

"(d) one who has been listed in such private organs as COUNTERATTACK, RED CHANNELS, FIRING LINE?

"(e) an artist who in the public mind, or at least a goodly section of the public, is deemed 'controversial'?

"(f) any other category?

"2. If such criteria are to be met, does your organization leave the application of them to the advertising agency and the network or do you take an active interest?

"3. Is it your experience that the employment of 'controversial' personalities hurts the sale of products?

"4. Are you satisfied with the way the question has been handled to date?"

That is rather silly stuff to spend 100 thousand dollars on; the answers are the answers of any normal, loyal, reasonably cautious individual with a public responsibility in a field of public service: Certainly, there are certain criteria (they call it political, I call it moral) which should be met by artists to be engaged.

Named as a Communist by a government? -- Certainly.

One who was an unfriendly witness before a government investigating body? If the witness took the Fifth Amendment, yes, or if he defied a committee legitimately trying to get information, yes.

One who has been listed in such private organs as "Counterattack", "Red Channels," or "Firing Line"? Certainly not, without completely corroborative supporting evidence from official sources.

An artist who, in the public mind or at least before a goodly section of the public, is deemed controversial? Certainly not. Controversy is the life blood

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

of self government.

And I believe those are the answers that any run of the mine American citizen or employer would give. The questionnaire that I received was somewhat different, and the last I have heard of it was last May. I was asked whether I would be interviewed on my own experiences. I said I would be glad to be but the interviews were passed up, and I've heard nothing for the last three months.

"Studies" -- in the grand manner of the Fund for the Republic.

It reminds you of the old WPA theater project days.

September 1, 1955

A FEW SPECIFIC PROJECTS

Now, tonight, I'd like to give you some of the specific projects, for which the Fund for the Republic -- headed by Robert Maynard Hutchins and financed by a no-strings-attached grant of 15 million dollars from the Ford Foundation -- has made specific grants. I think you may be interested to see how this money of yours is being spent. whether, in your opinion, it is being spent in the general American public interest, or whether, perhaps, it represents a pattern of political propaganda and ideology that is rather reminiscent of the propaganda line of the Communist Party, the Americans for Democratic Action, and the CIO Political Action Committee.

And once again, I shall read this list of grants to you just as they appear, in the words of Mr. Hutchins himself, together with the amounts which he states for each one.

To the American Bar Foundation. for studies by the special committee in Individual Rights, as effected by National Security. \$50,000.

To the American Friends Service Committee, for job opportunity programs in Dallas, Texas, and Greensboro, North Carolina; integration in Washington, D. C., and work with American Indians. \$139,500.

For a two year program of support in legal cases, to strengthen the right to freedom of conscience, \$150,000.

For assistance to radio tape programs, on civil liberties topics. \$5,000.

For the American Heritage Council, for a two year program dealing with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution in cooperation with the Illinois Department of the American Legion. \$50,000. (Incidentally, I have inquiries in, with the Legion, to find out what that one is all about.)

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

For the American Library Association. . . . for assistance in the production and distribution of the newsletter on Intellectual Freedom. \$6,000.

For the Association of the Bar of the City of New York Fund, Incorporated, for a study and report by the special committee on the Federal Loyalty-Security program. \$100,000.

For aid to defendants in Civil Liberties cases. \$5,000.

For the Carry Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, Incorporated, for the "Freedom Agenda" program; preparation of educational materials and conduct of a national discussion program. \$111,610.

For the Catholic Interracial Council of Chicago, to expand a program for reducing interracial tensions. \$18,000.

For the Civic Area Committee, Waverly, Iowa Chamber of Commerce, special award for constructive action in racial relations. \$10,000.

Columbia University: For a two day conference on Community Security versus Man's Right to knowledge. \$4,500.

(And all of these additional items are under the heading Columbia University, as well as the above. . . . mind you, I am reading these items just as they appear in order, not deleting any of them)

To prepare and distribute material pertaining to the bi-centennial celebration, including a documentary film "Freedom to read", radio programs and a pamphlet series, \$40,000.

For a pilot study by the bureau of applied social research of current situations, involving pressures on local educational institutions, \$3,000.

For preparation by the bureau of applied social research of a program for a study of "extremist groups". \$15,300.

For a pilot study of tenure law, and practice of American colleges and universities by the American Academic Freedom project. \$10,000.

For the common council for American unity, for expanding the work of protecting the legal rights of aliens. \$15,000.

For research on 2,000 legal cases affecting aliens. \$32,500.

Cornell University; for a study by H. Mark Roelofs. \$6,500.

For a prospectus on Civil Liberties, by Robert E. Cushman. \$7,000.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

(Cushman, by the way, is listed as a consultant to the Fund.)

Council for Social Action, of the Congregational Christian Churches, to promote discussion of Civil Liberties Issues. \$20,000.

That's all I'll bore you with tonight. I'll pick up again, later where we left off. but that starter at least gives you an idea of how Mr. Robert M. Hutchins, formerly of the University of Chicago, and his Fund for the Republic, is spending its 15 million dollar grant from the Ford Foundation. And it also gives you an opportunity to consider whether you approve of your money being spent in that way.

More tomorrow night on the Fund for the Republic -- and in the meantime, thanks to those of you who have written in with tips on the various projects and individuals involved here. all of those tips are run down, and checked and counterchecked of course. but they are very helpful, and in essence, of course, they constitute a very healthy process. the process by which you do your own reporting, in your own self interest. Whatever else you may have, any of you, by all means send along.

September 2, 1955

NOT AS ADVERTISED

We seem to have stirred up considerable furor as a result of my broadcast last night, disclosing that the Fund for the Republic has made a grant of 50 thousand dollars to the American Heritage Council for a project in cooperation with the Illinois Department of the American Legion. I said last night that I was going to inquire into that one, and I have spent the entire day doing so, with rather astounding results.

This becomes tremendously important, because this one seems to involve direct politics as well as the Legion, and therefore, before I go ahead with this report, I think I'd better read you the precise wording from the annual report of the Fund for the Republic, under Dr. Hutchins' signature, in which he tells about this grant. Here it is. and I suggest that you listen carefully, because these are very pretty words:

"The Illinois Department of the American Legion, in cooperation with the American Heritage Council of Chicago, has adopted a plan of popular education, centering around the discussion of the basic documents in the history of the United States. Irving Breakstone, Commander of the Illinois Department, calls this educational effort a "positive approach" to Communism. He has expressed the hope that the program will spread throughout the Departments of the Legion. The Fund for the Republic has made a grant to the American Heritage Council, to enable it to assist in this enterprise for two years."

And then, in the same annual report, in the list of actual grants, is the following:

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"American Heritage Council.....for a two year program dealing with the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, in cooperation with the Illinois Department of the American Legion.....fifty thousand dollars". That's quite a little lettuce, as the saying goes.....and you'll note that the words are VERY PRETTY.

This morning, bright and early, I received the following telegram, from a high official of the Illinois Department of the Legion, as follows:

"Dear Mr. Lewis: In your broadcast last night, Thursday, you startled me with your disclosure that the Fund for the Republic has allocated the sum of 50 thousand dollars to the American Legion, Department of Illinois, for furtherance of the 'thing' called 'American Heritage Council'. You promised to get more information about this particular appropriation. In seeking your further facts, I hope you will get them from the right sources -- not from Illinois' Department Commander Irving Breakstone, who is at present a very controversial figure in the American Legion, but from some of the Legion officials who have fought and are still fighting against American Heritage as a Legion project. Right now, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, is in convention at Springfield, Illinois. I suggest that you contact one of the following (and then he listed three of the top Illinois Legion officials, including one Edward Clamage, former State Commander of the Legion, and presently, Chairman of the Illinois anti-subversive Committee). The telegram then continued:

"Any of these gentlemen can give you the real story. I believe all of them are staying at the Abraham Lincoln Hotel in Springfield. It is my opinion that your disclosure figuratively may blow the roof off the convention hall in Springfield -- that is, if you make your contacts at once, so that delegates may have time to act before the sessions end, on Saturday." That is the end of the telegram, and I think you'll admit that it's interesting.

I got Mr. Clamage on the telephone. I asked him whether this joint project between the Legion and the American Heritage Council has been approved by the Illinois Department officially, and his reply was no. He said it has not been approved either by the Illinois Legion Convention, or by the State Executive Committee. He said it was not even submitted to either one. This is strictly a deal between the State Commander, Irving Breakstone, and the American Heritage Council.

On the contrary, he said the Cook County Council of the Legion, which comprises 400 Legion Posts in and around Chicago, held a meeting about two months ago, in which they tore the whole project apart, and adopted a resolution in effect repudiating the whole thing, and demanding that the project be submitted to the entire convention, now in session.

He cautioned me not to get this organization confused with the Heritage Foundation, an organization of the highest type in which former Dean Pat Manion of

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Notre Dame University Law School is a prominent figure -- which organization published the Manion book, "Key to Peace", back in 1950.

Mr. Clamage told me that he and his committee were preparing to submit to the Springfield convention, this afternoon or tomorrow, a resolution calling on Congress for an exhaustive investigation of tax exempt foundations -- as a result of the furor over the experience with the American Heritage Council, and this 50 thousand dollar grant from the Fund for the Republic.

So at this stage, the pretty words from the annual report, which I read you a few moments ago, begin to show a little tarnish.

The next move seemed to be to get hold of the American Heritage Council, the address of which is 160 N. LaSalle St., Chicago, Illinois, and I found that the Executive Director of it is a man by the name of Victor Rubin. Later in the day, another person to whom I talked said they dropped in at the office about a year ago or more, out of curiosity, and found a desk, two chairs and one bookcase, with Mr. Rubin the only occupant.

I talked to Mr. Rubin. I read to him the statement by Robert M. Hutchins in the annual report of the Fund for the Republic, and he said there must be a typographical error or something because the statement was quite incorrect. He said that instead of the statement that the project is a "positive approach to Communism" -- the correct statement is that the project is "a positive approach to Americanism".....and that this is the wording that always has been used by him and by Mr. Breakstone.

I asked whether the project has the official sanction of the Illinois Department of the Legion, and he said, Oh yes; it was officially sanctioned in 1947. In view of the fact that the American Heritage Council's date of incorporation was July of 1951, I failed to see how this was possible, so he explained it all.

He said that originally, the Illinois State Legislature set up a commission during World War II, to promote interfaith harmony and good will in Illinois, and that this continued until 1947, when it was decided to supplant this with a private contribution, nonprofit corporation, named the Committee for the Protection of the American Heritage. This, he said, was reorganized and reincorporated in 1951, as the American Heritage Council.

Perhaps I should note here that there is an American Heritage Foundation, established by Winthrop W. Aldrich and other financiers in February of 1947, which operated the famous Freedom Train, and has remained in existence ever since, with headquarters in New York. But you can forget that, except for the fact that the name American Heritage Council, very similar, was adopted by Mr. Rubin's outfit in Chicago four years later.

So under the first organization, the Committee for Protection of the

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

American Heritage, the Illinois Department convention of the Legion had voted approval of the then stated aims of the then organization, and that is the approval which the present American Heritage Council has from the Legion, for its 50 thousand dollar Fund for the Republic project.

He said the money actually comes to his organization, and it in turn, pays printing costs of meetings for discussion groups, in the various Legion chapters. I suggest you keep in mind that the foundation of this organization is still the promotion of interracial and interfaith harmony and good will -- a fine enough aim in itself, but hardly as stated by Dr. Hutchins.

Mr. Rubin told me that there never was any board of directors until the present corporation was set up in 1951, although he himself has been running the series of organizations from the beginning.

I told him I understood that the Cook County Council of the Legion had repudiated the project in a meeting about two months ago. After some little hemming and hawing, and saying that he was not there and didn't know exactly what happened, he ended by suggesting that perhaps the fight was the result of factional conflict within the Legion. . . . he had heard various reports but he really doesn't know what did happen.

So much for Mr. Victor Rubin of the American Heritage Council, to which the Fund for the Republic, under Mr. Robert M. Hutchins, former Chancellor of the University of Chicago whose administration of which was specially investigated by the State Legislature, after which he resigned -- to which Mr. Hutchins' Fund for the Republic gave a grant of 50 thousand dollars for this project.

Now --

From there, I continued checking and counterchecking, and I produced the following:

It develops that the reorganization of the 1947 Committee for the Protection of the American Heritage, into the present American Heritage Council, which took place in 1951, was the result of the efforts of one Barnett Hodes, a Chicago politician from the old Mayor Kelly machine, whose bailiwick was the Chicago district which includes the University of Chicago, from which Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, just then, was being severed as chancellor -- or to be entirely fair, was severing himself.

Mr. Victor Rubin himself corroborated this, and said rather proudly that Mr. Hodes was the first Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Heritage Council, and that a man named Wilbur C. Ummecke, or something like that, was the Chairman of the Executive Committee. Thus far I have nothing about the latter, and perhaps it doesn't matter too much, because Mr.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Victor Rubins averred that he and Mr. Hodes are the real leaders of the council and have been running the show all the way through.

Mr. Hutchins, on leaving the University of Chicago, in 1951, at the time this organization was set up in its present form, went, of course, directly to the Ford Foundation -- not the Fund for the Republic, where he is now, but the Ford Foundation. . . . the big outfit at the top. . . . the parent group. He became, there, a member of the Board and a very prominent figure, under the sponsorship of the top head of the Foundation, Paul Hoffman.

It now develops that as soon as the American Heritage Council was set up in its present form, at this 1951 juncture, the organization immediately received a grant of 35 thousand dollars a year from the Ford Foundation itself. . . . the one in which Dr. Hutchins now had moved.

Then, when Dr. Hutchins moved over to the Fund for the Republic, his first year there is marked by this 50 thousand dollar grant to the same organization.

Now, let me read you, again, the statement by Dr. Hutchins, in the annual report of the Fund for the Republic:

"The Illinois Department of the American Legion, in cooperation with the American Heritage Council of Chicago, has adopted a plan of popular education, centering around the discussion of the basic documents in the history of the United States. Irving Breakstone, Commander of the Illinois Department, calls this educational effort, a "positive approach" to Communism. He has expressed the hope that the program will spread throughout the Departments of the Legion. The Fund for the Republic has made a grant to the American Heritage Council to enable it to assist in this enterprise for two years."

And --

"Grant to the American Heritage Council, for a two year program dealing with the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution, in cooperation with the Illinois Department of the American Legion, \$50,000."

Monday night, I'll give you some information on the futile efforts of the Heritage Foundation, and the American Legion, to get some grants from the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic, for distribution of copies of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution to all of the school children of the nation. They couldn't get a dime.

September 5, 1955

NOW, BE IT RESOLVED

Our inquiries into the Fund for the Republic have now reached the stage of

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

spot news developments, and it appears very likely that the 50 thousand dollar allocation which the Fund -- which is headed by former chancellor Robert Maynard Hutchins of the University of Chicago -- awarded to an organization named the American Heritage Council in Chicago, for a propaganda program in cooperation with the Illinois Department of the American Legion, will be repudiated by the Legion and will never materialize.

This American Heritage Council should NOT be confused with the older organization, the American Heritage Foundation in New York, which put on the very admirable "Freedom Train" project and other patriotic and public service activities. This one, the American Heritage Council, dates back to 1951, when a Chicago politician by the name of Barnet Hodes who had the reputation of being the legal brains behind the Ed Kelly political machine, took over a movement run by a man named Victor Rubin, made himself chairman of the Board of Directors, and incorporated the project under the somewhat plagiaristic name, the American Heritage Council.

As I reported to you Friday night, Hodes comes from the University of Chicago area, where Robert Maynard Hutchins -- after a very smelly special investigation of the University by the State Legislature's Broyles Committee -- was just then resigning, as chancellor, to become an associate director of the newly organized Ford Foundation. Almost immediately, the American Heritage Council began receiving 35 thousand dollars a year, as financing, from the Ford Foundation. Hutchins was shifted to the Fund for the Republic in June 1954, a year ago, and shortly thereafter, the Fund for the Republic made this highly controversial award of 50 thousand dollars for this same American Heritage Council. Mr. Hutchins -- in his announcement of the award -- said it was for a program of popular education by the council, in cooperation with the Illinois Department of the American Legion.

Investigation developed the fact that the Illinois Department of the Legion has never even considered, let alone approved, the project, and neither has the State executive council, and that this was strictly the personal project of the State Commander, Irving Breakstone. The Cook County council of the Legion repudiated the project about two months ago, and the project was to come up for heated discussion in the annual State convention, Thursday, Friday, and Saturday of last week. On Saturday afternoon, Chairman Edward Clamage, of the State Committee on Subversive Activities, presented a resolution to the convention, which was adopted by unanimous vote, and it read as follows:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, in Committees known as the Cox and Reece Committees on Tax Exemption formally have issued voluminous documentation showing that certain of these Foundations have departed from the original intent and purposes as enumerated in Legislation passed by Congress, and,

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"Whereas these Foundations instead of engaging in education, philanthropic and charitable endeavors have diverted huge sums of tax-exempt money to the propagandizing of alien philosophies, and to engage in left-wing political activities and,

"Whereas certain of these Foundations have expressly allocated funds to investigate investigating committees of Congress, and to investigate individual members of the very Congress which granted them tax exemption, and,

"Whereas the notorious Fund for the Republic, headed by Robert Maynard Hutchins, has expressed its intent to investigate the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the American Legion,

"Now, be it resolved, that the American Legion, Department of Illinois, assembled in Springfield, September 1st through September 4, 1955, urgently requests that the 84th Congress, Second Session, appropriate sufficient funds to continue a full and thorough investigation of all tax exempt Foundations, to determine what Foundations should have their tax-exempt status revoked;

"And be it further resolved, that this resolution should be adopted by the 37th National Convention, to be assembled in Miami, Florida, October 10, 1955."

That is the end of the resolution. However, an amendment was offered which also was adopted by unanimous vote as follows:

"Be it further resolved that all files of the Executive Department of the United States government, be made available for the examination by such Congressional Committees as shall be engaged in this task."

A still further amendment was offered Saturday afternoon, which was designed to specifically and positively repudiate the project with the American Heritage Council, and to have no part of the 50 thousand dollars from Mr. Hutchins' Fund for the Republic, but the State Commander, Irving Breakstone, who was in the chair at the time, saved face for himself by ruling that it was out of order, because it was not germane to the rest of the resolution.

Charles Marshall of Chicago, appealed the ruling to the convention as a whole -- an action which takes a two thirds vote.....and on the voice vote, Commander Breakstone ruled that the two thirds had failed.

That leaves it up to the new State Commander, Al Leonhard, to whom I talked by telephone about an hour ago at his home in DeKalb, Illinois.....he informed me that he is calling a meeting of his advisors in about two weeks, to make a final disposition of the project, once and for all. But he added that in his opinion there is no existing authorization for the project, so far as the Legion is concerned, and I rather gathered that, in the light of wording about

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

the Fund for the Republic in Saturday afternoon's resolution, he has no stomach for the project.

So goes the story of this particular one of the projects for the Fund for the Republic under Robert Maynard Hutchins -- 50 thousand dollars of your money, entirely tax free. There is, however, a little more to the story.

It seems that back in 1951, still another organization, known as the Heritage Foundation, was in the course of publishing the great book "Key to Peace" by former Dean Manion of Notre Dame University. The top level Americanization Committee of the National Legion, thinking that this book should be in the hands of the youth of the nation, wrote an application to the Ford Foundation, which then had just been formed with Paul Hoffman as director and Robert Maynard Hutchins as a highly paid associate director, asking for a grant of sufficient money to distribute the "Key to Peace" to school children and libraries all over the country. At that time, the headquarters of the Ford Foundation was in Pasadena, California. It was exactly ten days -- and straight train mail was used in both directions -- exactly ten days from the dispatching of the application to the time the answer was received, and the reply was refusal of the Legion's application, on the grounds that it was "outside the scope of activities of the Ford Foundation."

Later, the Legion made an application to the Ford Motor Company itself, in that according to them, the Ford Motor Company -- like other large corporations -- do make direct grants on occasions, to worthy projects. This also was turned down. Still later, the Legion received word from the Ford Foundation that it would like an audience before the Americanism Committee of the Legion to discuss a project. The Committee agreed, and said they would hear either Paul Hoffman -- who then was active in the Ford Foundation -- or Robert Maynard Hutchins.

Instead of either of these, a young man turned up, who from his description may well have been W. H. Ferry, the Vice-President of the present Fund for the Republic, and attempted to persuade the Legion to accept responsibility for handling a project, similar to the one that is presently in question -- in fact, there are indications that it was the same project.

The Americanism Commission turned down the idea, but suggested, as an alternative, that the Ford Foundation make an allocation to finance the distribution of a copy of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, to every grade school and high school student in the United States.... if they were so interested in publicizing these two documents, here was an excellent way to achieve the end.

This also was turned down, and the Legion got not so much as a worn penny. But the American Heritage Council, headed by the Chicago politician Barnet Hodes from the old stamping ground of Robert Maynard Hutchins, got handsome support.

September 6, 1955

THE SOURCE OF THE FUND'S RESOURCES

Getting back to our Fund for the Republic and the Ford Foundation, my mail staff informs me that a lot of inquiries are coming in, asking why I keep saying that this money belongs to you and me. to the general public. The answer to that lies in the source of the money.

The Ford Foundation was given, out of the Henry and Edsel Ford estates, approximately 89-1/2 percent of the stock of the Ford Motor Company, which now is on the books of the Foundation at a little less than 500 million dollars, although in the basis of its earning capacity, it would be worth several times that. This is non-voting stock, and the remaining stock, which is voting stock, is in the hands of the Ford family.

This arrangement made it possible, of course, for the family to retain control of the Ford Motor Company; and for the great bulk of the Ford estate to be free of any Federal estate taxes, which would have eaten up most of the estate, if it had been a straight bequest. What was done, really, was to give 90 percent of the Estate to this Ford Foundation, on a tax free basis, leaving only 10 percent to be subject to taxation, and the remainder of the estate was able to handle the taxes on that.

Now, the reason the bequest to the Ford Foundation was tax free, was that ostensibly, the money was being given to the general common welfare -- for the benefit of all the people -- so that there was no reason for government to take part in taxes for that objective. Instead of paying part of it in taxes, and retaining the rest as private property, the gist of this is that the estate is giving all of it. And that being so, the assumption is that the money must be used for the benefit of the general, overall public welfare.

It is in that sense that I referred to the money in the Ford Foundation, and the Ford Foundation money that was passed on to the Fund for the Republic, as belonging to you and me and the general public. The fact is that under the law, the Foundation has to file with the Federal Bureau of Internal Revenue a statement of justification, stating what they intend to do with the money, and how they are going to spend it for the general public welfare; and the Bureau of Internal Revenue has to pass on that and officially approve it.

Unfortunately, and I think wrongfully, the law now provides that these statements of justification are confidential, and the public may not have access to them. That seems entirely unreasonable to me, because if these monies are to be spent for the public welfare, the individual citizen ought to be able to know what the stated objectives are, so as to be able to check on whether the money is being properly spent. Be that as it may, the original Ford Foundation bequest was free from all Federal estate taxes, and the running income in the form of dividends on Ford Motor Company stock, is entirely free of income tax.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Now the law provides that such a foundation may be free of taxes if it is organized and operated "exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to animals or children", and provided, further, that "no part of the net earnings" of the Foundation shall "inure to the benefit of any private shareholder, or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda or otherwise attempting to influence legislation and which does not participate in or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office."

So, it is within that scope that the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic, with its 15 million dollars of Ford Foundation money, has to operate.

Now, I began, last week, reading you the actual list of projects of the Fund for the Republic, as they appear in the annual report of that organization, just published -- but we got side-tracked on one involving the American Legion in Illinois, and an outfit called the American Heritage Council. Having discovered the fact that the American Legion is not in on the project at all, let's resume the list again. You see, one of the things that makes it possible for outfits like this Fund for the Republic to do the things they do, and get away with them, is that so few people have access to the facts.....you don't have access to this annual report of the Fund for the Republic.....the average individual wouldn't know what to look for, if the report were available. But I have it right here in front of me, so let's pick up the list again -- and once more, I am not selecting these items.....I am reading you the full list in the exact order in which they appear:

"Common Council for American Unity.....for expanding the work of protecting the legal rights of aliens, \$15,000.

"For research on 2 thousand legal cases affecting aliens, \$32,500.

"Cornell University, for a study by H. Mark Roelofs, \$6,500.

"For a prospectus on Civil Liberties, by Robert E. Cushman, \$7,000.

(I might interject here that Robert E. Cushman is listed elsewhere in this report as a regular consultant to the Fund for the Republic).

"Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches.....to promote the discussion of Civil Liberties issues, \$20,000.

"National Book Committee.....for a preliminary exploration of the theory of the right to publish and to read, \$9,000.

"National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools.....for a radio series on

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

problems confronting public schools, \$35,000.

"National Council of the Churches of Christ in the USA (that is the Bishop Oxnham outfit). . . . for the work of the Department of racial and cultural relations in border States, \$10,000.

"New York Public Library. . . . toward the support of the Central Reference Room, \$2,000.

"Public Education Association. . . . to assist in a survey of alleged segregation in New York City Schools, \$10,000.

"Southern Regional Council. . . . for preparation and distribution of a summary of the book, 'The Negro and the Schools', \$5,000.

"For expanding community education in intergroup relations in 12 States, \$240,000.

"Stanford University School of Law. . . . to finance a summer study on a civil liberties topic by members of the Stanford Law Review, \$5,000; and for an analysis of testimony of witnesses in proceedings relative to Communism, \$25,000.

"Universalist Church of America. . . . for an educational program, by the Universalist Service Committee, in cooperation with the Freedom Agenda Program \$4,000 (Incidentally, we'll go into that freedom agenda program in a later broadcast. . . .)

"University Young Women's Christian Association of Westwood, California. . . . special award for maintaining an 'open platform' policy, \$5,000.

"Voluntary Defenders Committee, Inc., of Massachusetts, to provide counsel for indigent defendants in criminal court, \$40,000.

"Young Men's Christian Association, to the National Board for a background paper on civil liberties; and for cooperation with the 'Freedom Agenda' program, \$6,000

"Young Women's Christian Association, for cooperation with the 'Freedom Agenda' program, \$8,000."

Now that's the end of the list of grants, and I'd be interested to know just how many of those projects you feel are of benefit to you as a citizen and tax payer who has to make up the taxes which are NOT being paid by the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic. Also, whether you feel that there are any political or legislative propaganda connotations involved in these projects.

September 7, 1955

WHO DIRECTS THE SPENDING
OF THIS 26 MILLION?

Some very interesting developments have taken place in the last 24 hours regarding the Ford Foundation, specifically, an announcement last night of the formation of a huge scholarship foundation fund with headquarters in Chicago, to finance college educations for worthy and promising young students who otherwise could not afford them. The Ford Foundation has contributed 20 million dollars -- the Carnegie Foundation 500 thousand -- the Sears Roebuck Foundation has contributed 600 thousand, and Time, Incorporated has given 30 thousand. That brings the total to 21 million, 130 thousand dollars -- of which one million dollars a year will be spent in 4 year scholarships, totaling 6,000 dollars each -- for the 4 years -- and another 8 million is available to be matched by business, industry and individuals in contributions for additional scholarships. Thus potentially the entire scholarship program would come eventually to 26 million dollars. The announced objectives of the scholarship setup are as follows:

(1) "To locate the most able youth; (2) To make it possible for them to get a college education regardless of their financial needs; (3) To make it easy for business to contribute effectively to the support of higher education."

All very admirable and commendable, and it would certainly appear that so far as the Ford Foundation is concerned, it is an effort to redeem itself, in the public eye, for some of the things that have been done in the past, notable among them the gift of 15 million dollars to the so-called Fund for the Republic, which is being used essentially for left wing propaganda, along the line of the ADA -- the Americans for Democratic Action -- the CIO Political Action Committee and the general official line of the Communist Party.

This, at least, is a project for the general public welfare here in the United States, and it is a worthy follow-up to the grant which the Ford Foundation made earlier this year -- 50 million dollars to improve the salaries of school and college teachers over the nation.....worthy, that is, if it is administered legitimately.

The wording of the original announcement, however, seems to be very broad -- as wide as the ocean -- as to how the individuals are to be selected for these scholarships.....for example, it says that "the awards will go to high school students who, through aptitude testing and other means, are adjudged most capable of benefiting from a college education."

That leaves the whole program wide open, and dependent, really, on the individuals who administer it -- which, as usual becomes the all important consideration. As to the announced Board of Directors of the project, there has not been time today to make any detailed run-down on them, but the Chairman

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

of the Board of Directors is announced as Mr. Laird Bell of Chicago, on whom I do have some information.

He was a classmate of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt at Harvard University, and was a great friend and admirer of Mr. Roosevelt. He also was a close friend and admirer of Robert Maynard Hutchins, when the latter was chancellor of the University of Chicago. . . . in fact, he was a member of Hutchins' Board of Trustees of the University from the time Hutchins took over at Chicago, until two years after Hutchins left to go to the Ford Foundation in 1951. At the end, he was Chairman of the Board of Trustees.

When the University of Chicago was under investigation by the special Broyles Committee of the Illinois State legislature, Laird Bell spent some hours on the witness stand, defending Mr. Hutchins. Laird Bell was a defender of Alger Hiss, one-time president of the English Speaking Union, President of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, and now is on the Board of Trustees of Harvard University. He has been a long time and rather violent opponent and critic of congressional investigations into Communism and other subversive activities, even from the days of the original Dies Investigating Committee.

His name appeared on the letterhead of the Committee for an Effective Congress as a member of its Board of Advisors -- which Committee you remember in connection with its shadowy activities in support of Senator Ralph Flanders of Vermont and his activities in the Army-McCarthy investigation.

He participated vociferously in opposing the firing of school teachers who took the fifth amendment and in September of 1953 was chairman of a dinner committee, to welcome Adlai Stevenson back to Chicago after his trip around the world. Despite this partisan activity and the fact that he is listed in "Who's Who" as a Democrat, plus the fact that he contributed one thousand dollars to the Senatorial election campaign fund of Democratic Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois a year ago, President Eisenhower appointed him a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange in February of this year, and in July appointed him an alternate United States delegate to the United Nations.

That seems to tell the story of Mr. Laird Bell of Chicago, who is at the head of this 20 million dollar scholarship fund -- for whatever you can make out of it -- favorable, or otherwise.

In the meantime, it appears that the grant of 25 thousand dollars by the Fund for the Republic -- with its 15 million dollars of Ford Foundation money -- to Leland Stanford University in California, for a study of the testimony of Elizabeth Bentley, Louis Budenz, Whittaker Chambers, and other reformed Communists, is heading into trouble.

The Dean of the Stanford University Law School, which is to receive this

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

grant, made the deal with the Fund for the Republic on his own responsibility, without submitting it to the Board of Trustees of the University, or otherwise asking their authorization.

That perhaps is all right. . . . maybe he has the authority, this Dean Carl B. Spaeth, to make the original deal on his own; but there's one little hurdle that Dean Spaeth, and the Fund for the Republic have failed to figure on. The official announcement of this project, signed by Robert M. Hutchins, as President of the Fund for the Republic says:

"The study will be conducted under the direction of Herbert Packer of the New York and Supreme Court bars, who will work in Washington until January 1 and join the Stanford Law Faculty on that date".

In short, as I've pointed out before, the truth about this project is that it is really a project to be handled by the Fund for the Republic, through their own employee, Herbert Packer, who has just finished doing another similar project for them -- but by making the grant to Leland Stanford University and having the employee hired as a member of the Stanford Law Faculty for the period during which he is doing the job, the work acquires the prestige and standing of the Stanford Law School. Except that there is one little catch:

For young Mr. Herbert Packer to be attached to the faculty of the Stanford Law School, he DOES have to be approved by the University's Board of Trustees, and Dean Spaeth is going to find that that is considerably more of a chore than he expects, because backstage indications are that the Board of Trustees is just going to sit by and do nothing. . . . and doing nothing means that Mr. Packer will not get on the Law Faculty, and if he doesn't get on the Law Faculty, he can't very well do this survey as a member of the Faculty.

September 8, 1955

MEMO FROM A LADY

I told you about 10 days ago of the interview which I had with the Vice-President of the Fund for the Republic, W. H. Ferry, known by the nickname "Ping" in his office at the Fund headquarters in New York. I told you at the time that without any permission from me, I found in the midst of the interview that a stenographer was sitting behind me, taking down the verbatim of the interview, to which, actually, I had no objection -- except as to the high handed manner in which it was done. I read to you a letter which I wrote to Mr. Ferry, asking for a copy of the transcript. Some ten days now have elapsed and it may interest you to know that I not only have not received the transcript, but I do not even have an acknowledgement of my letter.

In the meantime, I have received a memorandum from a very distinguished lady who lives near Pasadena, California, where the headquarters of the Ford Foundation used to be located, which I think you'll find interesting. I have

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

checked very carefully into the background of this lady, and I find it beyond reproach, and here is what she had to say:

"In your broadcast today, you mentioned Mr. W. H. Ferry, Vice-President of the Fund for the Republic. I remember when I had the pleasure of meeting him here at a friend's home in about 1952. The circumstances were unusual. A friend whose father had known Henry Ford the First, wrote to Henry Ford the Second, to tell him that one thing she had found out when she moved to Pasadena from Grosse Point (a suburb of Detroit) was that many people were keeping files on the Ford Foundation and that if it didn't get cleaned up, she thought it might blow up in his face. Shortly thereafter, she had a phone call from Mr. Ferry, who had flown out for the express purpose of finding out what was actually on her mind. She called a few of us over to her home, to meet Mr. Ferry. He was cold, almost insolent. And when we told him about how we felt about the Ford Foundation and its activities locally, I asked him if Henry Ford the Second had read "Prejudice and the Press" (which is a book on Robert M. Hutchins and his experience at the University of Chicago) or had seen the Broyles report concerning Robert Hutchins, and his answer was "yes". Then I said that if he had read just those two things, and still felt that Robert Hutchins was the man to be Vice-Chairman of the Ford Foundation, that it was a waste of his time and of ours to discuss the matter further. One man had the McCarran IPR report on Moses Finley, who was at Rutgers on a Ford grant. That was something new and Mr. Ferry was interested. After a rather strained evening, he rose and for the first time smiled, saying 'It might interest you to know that my father feels just as you do about the Ford Foundation'. He had told us earlier in the evening that he was often taken for Henry Ford's body-guard, as they were together so much.in fact, Mr. Henry Ford the Second was seldom seen without him."

That is the end of the letter, but it affords some additional light on the man who, together with the highly controversial Robert M. Hutchins, is running the Fund for the Republic, and distributing 15 million dollars in unrestricted gifts, to left-wing projects and to left-wing propaganda. The mention of his father, refers to a very distinguished and reasonably conservative gentleman by the name of Hugh Ferry, former President and Chairman of the Board of the Packard Motor Company.

The fact is, the record of Ping Ferry is a continuous story of extreme radicalism on the crusading level, and with Robert M. Hutchins and 15 million dollars worth of Ford money to spend he becomes a powerful force on the side of the Americans for Democratic Action, and the CIO Political Action Committee. That is worthy of notice at any time; it becomes particularly worthy of notice with a presidential election year coming up.

Among the most puzzling facets of the whole thing is the fact that these individuals are put into position by none other than Paul G. Hoffman, who claims to be a great and devoted friend of President Eisenhower, and whose counsel is

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

listened to by the President. Yet here is the instrument which he produced, at work avidly in a political election picture, dedicated to the very opposite of everything Mr. Eisenhower stands for. And the question arises, is this a legitimate operation for a tax free foundation? Are these projects which Mr. Ferry and Dr. Hutchins are financing, actually legitimate studies, or are they just propaganda fronts, with high-sounding names to lend dignity to them, the findings of which are decided by Mr. Ferry and company in advance? Why has it been necessary for Mr. Ferry to supply the individuals who are to conduct these projects, as he is trying to do in the Stanford Law School project. Those are points which the Bureau of Internal Revenue should go into because it affects the tax free status.

September 9, 1955

MORE ABOUT DEAN SPAETH

Now, tonight let's get back to the controversial Dean of the Stanford University Law School at Palo Alto, California, whom I never yet have been able to get on the telephone for interview purposes; Dean Carl B. Spaeth, friend and defender of Alger Hiss, protege of Nelson Rockefeller, State Department New Dealer during the war, and office mate of the named Communist, Gustavo Duran. It is Dean Spaeth who, without the approval of the University Board of Trustees, made a deal with the 15 million dollar Fund for the Republic, financed by the Ford Foundation, by which the prestige of the Stanford University Law School name would be given to a so-called study of the testimony of anti-communist witnesses, to be conducted by one of the Fund's own people.

There is evidence from my own mail that this is causing an indignant protest from Stanford Alumni all over the nation, as well it might, but that's a side point. The important angle at the moment is to try to throw some light on what makes this individual, Carl B. Spaeth, tick, and how his mind operates. I might mention first that it is somewhat obscure just what qualifications he has to be Dean of any Law School. . . . his biography in "Who's Who" shows a record that is largely political, and not very top political at that. He was Professor of Law for four years at Northwestern University back in the 30's, and an associate Professor of Law for one year at Yale; but there is no indication that he has ever even received an American law degree. There is no indication at all, of any actual practice of law, in this country.

In 1952, Dean Spaeth took a leave of absence from Stanford, to become Director of the division of overseas activities of the Ford Foundation, and it occurred to me that it would be interesting to you to see just how his fertile mind operated, in the selection of projects and the allocation of funds. I might mention that the total contributions in the foreign field, as of the last annual report a year ago, show approximately 10 million dollars. And here is at least the beginning of the list:

The Agricultural Missions, Inc., for rural development activities with its

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

constituent agencies and United Nations organizations, \$35,000.

The All-Pakistan Women's Association, for education of women in home economics, including college and rural training centers, \$482,000.

Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Board of Founders, for training of extension leaders and pilot extension projects, \$120,000.

American Branch of the International Social Services, incorporated, for a general program in International Social Service, \$150,000.

American Council on Education, for information and liaison between Universities and Government Agencies, on development programs abroad, \$87,000.

American Friends Service Committee, Incorporated; and there are several items in this one:

(For International Leadership Conference, \$175,000) -- junket, in other words.

(For Literacy and social improvement program in Southern Italy, \$82,000)

(For a village development project in Jordan, \$97,000)

American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, Inc., for aid to refugees, primarily in Europe, \$10,000.

The American Korean Foundation, Inc., for a general program, \$10,000.

American Relief for Poland, for aid to refugees, primarily in Europe, \$10,000.

The American Universities (plural) Field staff, Inc., for field staff to report on International Affairs to Universities and other institutions, \$450,000.

University of Ankara, Library School, \$95,775.

The Arab Development Society, for agricultural Vocational School for refugee boys, \$34,600.

The Catholic Association for the schools of Egypt, for rural village vocational school, \$30,240.

Board of Foreign Missions of the United Presbyterian Church of North America for a livestock improvement and agricultural extension program at Assiut College, Assiut, Egypt, \$55,072.

Government of the Union of Burma, for an agricultural Institute (this is the country of U Nu, the giggling premier, who says we in the United States talk too much) \$103,000.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Center for Oriental Studies, also Burma, \$230,000.

Same place, mass education council program, \$108,000.

Still same place, preliminary survey and advisory services to Burma Technical Institute, \$31,050.

Cornell University, Field evaluation of Indian Village development program, in cooperation with Lucknow University, \$173,300.

Delhi School of Economics, Delhi, India, for training and orientation center for Foreign specialists, working in India, \$14,177.

East European Fund, Incorporated, for Chekhov Publishing House, \$615,000.

Also, for research on the USSR, and orientation to U.S. life of recent Soviet emigres, \$393,500.

Far Eastern Association, Inc., for publication of Far Eastern Quarterly Journal and Far Eastern Monograph series, \$22,000.

The Corporation of Haverford College, for training Americans for work in Africa, in cooperation with the government of the Gold Coast, \$44,500.

To the Hindustani Talimi Sangh, for assistance in obtaining American teachers, \$3,000.

To the government of India, (and there are about a dozen of these -- to Mr. Nehru's layout.....this government that insults us at every turn).....here they are:

(For evaluation of village development and training center programs, \$305,446)

(For seminars on secondary education, \$58,500)

(For a study tour of Denmark by Indian rural educators, \$26,000)

(Supplementary grant for secondary education program, \$14,500)

(For training centers for administrative personnel of village development projects, \$184,000)

(For training centers for village extension workers and pilot village development project, \$1,759,196)

(For training centers in village crafts, \$407,575)

(For public education program in agriculture, \$276)

(For training centers in social education, for village development projects, \$182,733)

(For extension departments for agricultural colleges, \$139,724)

Let me remind you that all of this, for Dear India.....

(For inventory of rural higher education, \$22,525)

(For publication of a farm journal for village cultivators, \$19,995)

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

(For research and training for village and small scale industries, \$180,000)
(For training women for village extension work in home economics,
\$618,000)
(And to the Indian Institute of Public Administration, for a general program,
\$350,000)

That is Dean Carl Spaeth's concept of how the money of the Ford Foundation provided by the citizens of this nation over the years, should be spent. Money supposed to be devoted -- under the tax laws -- to the general American public welfare. I might mention that he now has a grant of some 600 thousand dollars to the Stanford University Law School, which he wants to devote to guess what - a study of legal and constitutional problems in India.

I'll give you some more Monday night. I guess that's about all you can stand in one dose, anyway.

September 12, 1955

THE AMERICAN LEGION ALERT!

The American Legion has suddenly stepped up in regard to the Fund for the Republic, financed by 15 million dollars from the Ford Foundation. The National Commander of the Legion last night issued a statement calling on all American Legion members and Posts to avoid any identification with activities sponsored by the Fund for the Republic. I think perhaps the best thing to do is to read his full statement to you so there'll be no question of any interpretation on my part, so here it is and I'm quoting:

"I am issuing this alert to our membership because it appears that the Fund for the Republic, headed by Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, is threatening and may succeed in crippling the national security. Study of projects and activities financed by the Fund for the Republic has convinced me that Hutchins and his associates are trying to propagandize Americans into believing that, one, Communism never has been and is not now a serious danger to this country; two, that sinister forces under pretext of fighting Communism are the real danger and threaten the civil liberties of all Americans; three, security measures are unAmerican and are being used to harass and persecute innocent people; four, intelligent and educated people are aware of these things, but are opposed by the ignorant who are being misled by evil demagogues.

"Many of the fellowship awards and other projects supported by the \$15,000,000 fund, give the impression that the organization is battling what it terms 'witch-hunts' and 'vigilanteism'. On the contrary, it seems to us that the effect of this constant, loaded criticism of Congressional and administration efforts to resist communist infiltration, is bound to be the encouragement of a form of intellectual vigilanteism, which would be a far more dangerous problem.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"I hope that American Legion elements at the State and local levels will have no truck with Fund for the Republic enterprises. If American Legion posts and departments (State organizations) are offered financial aid by the Hutchins group, to carry out the group's programs, I sincerely hope they will decline.

"The American Legion has consistently advocated and fought for a strong and united nation. By shrewd grants and expenditures, the Fund for the Republic is threatening, and may succeed in crippling the national security.

"The American Legion considers the propaganda of the Fund for the Republic to be as dangerous as it is untrue, but we recognize that even such propaganda as that being disseminated by the Fund for the Republic can be sold to many Americans, when millions of dollars are behind the sales effort.

"The record of the Hutchins' stated opinions on the subject of communist subversion supports the belief that he is 'peculiarly unsuited' for the responsibility of administering a multi-million dollar opinion moulding campaign.

"This man has made statements publicly which seemingly reflect his contemptuous attitude toward our legally constituted government. Because the U. S. Supreme Court upheld the Smith Act, outlawing the communist party, he blasted our highest tribunal, saying the decision 'indicated that we are at last up against a crisis in this country.'

"Only a couple of years ago, he made a sneering reference to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, stating 'today, we are cursed by a tremendous glorification of the FBI. The only people we will believe are confessed spies and traitors.'

"Hutchins is entitled to an opinion that communists should be given jobs in teaching and in government. He is entitled to his evident opinion that the Supreme Court law makers and the FBI are evil when they are intolerant of communists.

"By the same token, Legionnaires are entitled to know and be alerted against an operation, directed by Hutchins which, in our judgment, will not serve the cause of American unity and strength".

Commander Collins then quoted from the Fund for the Republic, last January, describing itself as "a non-profit organization, devoted to the promotion of principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights and to support activities toward the elimination of restrictions of freedom of thought, inquiry, and expression in the United States, and the development of policies and procedures, best adapted to protect these rights."

Collins then concluded: "That may well describe the hope of the Ford Foundation, when it established the Fund for the Republic. Unfortunately, it seems to

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

us that, with Hutchins at the helm, the Fund is tending in exactly the opposite direction -- toward the elimination of restrictions on those who apparently seek to destroy our freedoms."

Now, there is the full statement of the National Commander of the American Legion, Seaborne Collins, and there was an immediate challenge to that by Dr. Hutchins in New York. He said that Mr. Collins "has not bothered to try to find out the purposes and activities of the Fund, before attacking it".

"The fund is dedicated" he said, "to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution."

Mighty pretty words, except that some of us do keep files, and there was another day -- the occasion of the original announcement of the setting up of the Fund for the Republic -- when the program of the Fund was stated in somewhat more specific terms. I have that handout in front of me, under date of February 26, 1953, and this is what it had to say:

- "1. Restrictions and assaults upon academic freedom.
- "2. Due process and equal protection of the laws.
- "3. The protection of the rights of minorities.
- "4. Censorship, boycotting and blacklisting activities by private groups.
- "5. Principles of guilt by association, and its application in the United States today."

Now, I also have a letter from the United States Treasury Department in March of 1953, a few weeks later, in regard to tax exemption for the Fund for the Republic, and I quote from it:

"You shall not carry on propaganda, or otherwise attempt to influence legislation."

There is currently operating in the Senate a Judiciary Subcommittee, known as the Hennings Committee, studying the question of the status of Civil Rights and Civil Liberties in the United States. The object of that study is to determine whether existing laws are adequate, or whether changes or new laws may be needed.

The Fund for the Republic has just made a grant to American University here in Washington, for assistance to the Hennings Committee in this study. As of this morning, the Committee announced that it has added to its staff one Eleanor Bontecou, of Washington, D. C., to be a consultant, in all this work on loyalty-security matters.

The annual report of the Fund for the Republic contains the following listing, under Fellowship and grants in aid.the top of the list:

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"Eleanor Bontecou, Washington, D. C., to complete a book about the Federal Loyalty-Security program".

There are other items which I'm tracking down, but as yet have no report on. The question that interests me is whether this Fund for the Republic, with the decidedly slanted preconceptions on its leaders and directors, is infiltrating the investigating committees of Congress, and whether, if that is so, it is entitled to its tax-free status. -- Commissioner T. Coleman Andrews of the Bureau of Internal Revenue should be interested.

September 13, 1955

THE SUPER LIBERAL MR. FERRY

Now, tonight, ladies and gentlemen, the trail of the Fund for the Republic -- with its 15 million dollars from the Ford Foundation.....completely tax exempt at your expense and mine -- leads back to an individual by the name of W. H. Ferry.....Wilbur Hugh Ferry, I believe.....usually known as "Ping" Ferry, and the same character whom I interviewed at the headquarters of the Fund for the Republic in New York City some 2 weeks ago, at the start of this reportorial job.....the one who sat with his feet on his desk, the soles of his shoes staring me in the face at about 20 inches, throughout our conversation.

He becomes important, because all indications are that Mr. "Ping" Ferry is the real kingpin in the Fund for the Republic, despite the fact that he is only vice-president. The president, Robert Maynard Hutchins, formerly of the University of Chicago, parks himself out in California, at Pasadena, and operates by proxy, or by having the operating personnel in the New York office fly out to confer with him when and if that's necessary. So remember this "Ping" Ferry, because you're going to hear a lot more about him as time goes on.

One point, I want you to keep in mind as you hear these facts unfold, is that the tax laws are very specific in their insistence, that these funds -- this Fund for the Republic, specifically -- must not indulge in any political propaganda, in any manner, or attempt by propaganda or in any other manner, to influence legislation. With that fact as a backdrop in your mind, I want you, if you will, to appraise the picture that I unfold for you, and see whether there is, actually, any political motive, or objective, or design in these Fund for the Republic operations of Mr. "Ping" Ferry, and I think the best way to begin is back in the '30's when he worked for a while as a mediocre reporter on the Detroit TIMES.

He achieved there, and later, a reputation for being an agitator and professional non-conformist, arrogant in his attitude and super-liberal in his thinking, and in addition to the Detroit TIMES experience, he also held a job for a while on a newspaper in Manchester, New Hampshire, and later in Concord.

When the war came along, he got a job as chief inspector for the OPA in New Hampshire, in which capacity he had charge of the force that went around to

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

various places, including retail stores, searching for price control violations. In the course of these duties he incurred very considerable ill will, and his manner of handling himself seems not to have been calculated to ease the feelings of those whom he offended.

At the end of the war -- at the age of 34 -- he joined the New York public relations firm -- Earl Newsom & Company, and became public relations director for the notorious CIO Political Action Committee -- later dissolved because of its infamous reputation. This was the outfit that was concocted by Sidney Hillman, Lee Pressman, John Abt & Company, which names no doubt are familiar to you. Sidney Hillman certainly needs no identification. John Abt -- that's A-B-T -- was named as a card-carrying member of the Communist Party, but took the 5th amendment when questioned about it under oath. Lee Pressman also was named as a card carrier and took the 5th amendment, but later admitted under oath that he had been. So these were the political cronies of Mr. "Ping" Ferry in 1945 in the CIO Political Action Committee.

Now I have here a copy of TIME magazine -- under date of August 30th, 1954 -- that's just a year ago -- carrying a news item about Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins as head of the Fund for the Republic which he had been for about 3 months as of that time -- having just created a new office of vice-president of the Fund for the Republic, to which he had appointed a 43 year-old man identified as Mr. W. H. "Ping" Ferry, who it said, was a former teacher and newsman, who had worked with the ILO -- that is the radical International Labor Organization -- the OPA -- and the CIO Political Action Committee during the New Deal days. It tells about Mr. "Ping" Ferry joining the Earl Newsom & Company firm in 1945 and it said that his duties with that firm included writing speeches for Henry Ford the Second and doing "think work" for the Ford Foundation. Those are the words.

Now you'll recall in an earlier broadcast that I read to you a letter from a lady in Pasadena who reported on Mr. "Ping" Ferry -- said that he came to Pasadena about 3 years ago on a trouble shooting mission for the Ford Foundation and he told those present that he was with Henry Ford the Second so much, that most people mistook him - Ferry - for Ford's bodyguard. So it was just a year ago that Mr. "Ping" Ferry ensconced himself in the vice-presidency of the 15 million dollar Fund for the Republic, which is quite a supply of money compared with the few paltry millions he and John Abt and Lee Pressman and Sidney Hillman had to play with in their political activities back in the mid-forties, even with CIO membership to draw on.

Now in June of 1953, the legislature of the State of New Hampshire -- disturbed among other things by the revelations that had just come out in the perjury trials of William Remington, also of this same group, about his Communist connections on the campus of Dartmouth College -- ordered an investigation of subversive activities in the State of New Hampshire, and instead of ordering it done by a political committee of the Legislature, instructed instead,

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

that it be done by the Attorney General -- who then, as now, is a Mr. Louis Wyman. Attorney General Wyman started in September of '53 this is, and among his first subject of attention was Dartmouth College, where he went to interview such professors and instructors as might still be there from the days when Bill Remington was a student there -- and he met with considerable resistance in his efforts there too. At about this same time, the Secretary of the Communist Party in New Hampshire -- a woman by the name of Elba Chase, attacked the validity of the law which had been passed and under which the Attorney General was operating. Her defense attorney, serving without charge, was the then President of the State Bar Association -- Mr. John McLain of Manchester. It's not important to this story, but the state law was upheld -- Mrs. Elba Chase lost her case.

Now, I have a letter here over the signature of W. H. Ferry under date of November the 12th, 1953, when all this was going on and while "Ping" Ferry was still employed by the Earl Newsom & Company public relations firm in New York, doing "think work" for the Ford Foundation, and writing speeches and bodyguarding for Mr. Henry Ford the Second. The letter is addressed to the President of Dartmouth -- John S. Dickey -- Hanover, New Hampshire and remember, at this time, Remington had been serving a 3 year federal sentence for some 10 months -- and two weeks before the date of this letter the Federal Court of Appeals had upheld his conviction. It was Remington, you remember, who later was murdered by his fellow inmates in the Lewisburg Penitentiary at Pennsylvania. Here's the letter from "Ping" Ferry to President Dickey at Dartmouth.

"Dear President Dickey: I'm writing this at home, where I have just received a copy -- the copy of the New Hampshire Sunday News -- that indicates Wyman may be questioning the professors who were teaching at Dartmouth when Remington was at Hanover. If you can think of any way that I can be of assistance to the college here you have only to call on me. I shall be happy to take time off to lend a hand in Hanover or elsewhere. Wyman's is a fishing trip of a ranker stripe than most and should be resisted, derided and put in its proper, contemptible light. John McLain in Manchester is doing what honest men should be doing today. I have written him to say as much. He is not worrying about public relations, but about decency in the future of the Republic. If an example is needed, though why Dartmouth of all places should ever need an example, I don't know - McLain is it. It will distress me and a surprising number of people if Dartmouth cringes in any way before this proposition. This is no place for the fallacious, 'happy to cooperate' attitude. There are few enough pockets of independent thought left in the country. If Dartmouth aspires to continue its claim to this distinction, its program in the Wyman matter is clear. Please call on me if you can think of anything I can do. I'm putting myself forward as an indignant alumnus and not as a public relations counsel. Sincerely, W. H. Ferry"

This, then, is the young man who has been given 15 million dollars in tax

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

free money to spend on studies of the government's security program, fear in education, academic freedom, the extent of Communist infiltration into the American social system, a study of extremist groups, radio and television programs, awards to writers and others who, in the opinion of the Fund have distinguished themselves by the stand they have taken.

Now you ladies and gentlemen are perfectly competent to judge for yourselves whether there are political connotations and overtones in what I have just reported. Could it be perhaps that the old inner circle school of thinking of the CIO Political Action Committee finally has got for itself a 15 million dollar fund from the U. S. Treasury, because that's where most of this comes from.

September 14, 1955

THE 5th AMENDMENT LIBRARIAN

Getting around to our study of the Fund for the Republic, and what it is doing with the 15 million dollars it received from the Ford Foundation in tax exempt money, I quote the President of the Fund, Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, as follows:

"To dramatize the progress made in upholding Civil Liberties, the Fund for the Republic gives prizes to persons, organizations and communities that have distinguished themselves by the stand they have taken."

Now, let's cut back to May 21st, 1953, and a hearing before the Senate Internal Security Committee. There is a rather well known and respected individual in this country by the name of Herbert Philbrick, one time FBI secret agent in the Communist Party, with whose career you may be familiar via television, through the medium of his story, "I Led Three Lives". Several months prior to this particular hearing, Herbert Philbrick -- under oath before the same Committee -- had identified one Mary Knowles, as Secretary of the Samuel Adams School in Boston, which was controlled by members of the Communist Party.

At the May 21st hearing by the Committee, Mary Knowles was brought before it, and placed under oath, and told of the testimony that had been given against her, and she was afforded an opportunity to deny that testimony. The first two specific questions were, "Are you now a member of the Communist Party" and "have you attended cell meetings of the Communist Party in Boston, with Herbert Philbrick?" On both questions, Mrs. Mary Knowles refused to answer on the grounds of self-incrimination, the Fifth Amendment, and she did likewise on three additional questions along the same general line. As a result of this pleading the 5th amendment, she was let out of her job as a librarian in Norwood, Massachusetts, but subsequently, she got a job as librarian at the William Jeans Memorial Library, owned and operated by the Quaker Monthly Meeting, in Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania -- near Philadelphia.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

The actual employment of Mrs. Knowles for that job was done by the Library Committee of Plymouth Meeting, and the action immediately brought forth a storm of protest from the leading figures of that Quaker community. The Plymouth Township schoolboard forbade teachers to take children to the Library. Three members of the Library Committee itself resigned. Financial support from the local township was canceled. Resolutions have been passed by local chapters of the American Legion and the DAR, calling for her dismissal.

In the light of all this, the Fund for the Republic surveyed the situation, and under the policy which I read to you a few moments ago, Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins announced a special \$5,000 award to the Quaker Monthly Meeting, "for courageous and effective defense of Democratic principles, in refusing to fire Mrs. Knowles." He said that "the award was being made because the Fund for the Republic hopes that the example that was set in this case will be followed elsewhere in America -- particularly when our libraries, which seem to be a special target of self-appointed censors and amateur loyalty experts, are involved."

There is a slight gimmick, however: It so happens that it was not the Quaker Monthly Meeting that hired Mrs. Knowles, and that refused to get rid of her. It was the Library Committee. And the Quaker Monthly Meeting, to which the \$5,000 check was made out, has thus far refused to accept it, and has not cashed the check. That, however, has nothing to do with the intent or philosophy of Dr. Robert Hutchins. He still thinks that it is a great act of patriotism and public service, for a library committee to hire an accused communist, and he still thinks it is worthy of a 5 thousand dollar prize.

Mrs. Eleanor B. Stevenson, wife of the President of Oberlin College, Ohio, and a member of the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic, was designated to make the award, personally, and in attempting to do so she said she wanted to make it clear that the gift was in tribute to the Friends (Quakers) for their realization that whatever Mrs. Knowles past associations may or may not have been, she is a loyal American and a highly qualified librarian.

"She has every right to earn a living and to be treated with respect accorded a human being in these United States."

Very fine stuff, and all very appealing. And if Mrs. Knowles has reformed, really, and no longer is a communist, all well and good.

Tomorrow, Mrs. Mary Knowles, now of Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania, will appear once again, under oath, before that same Senate Internal Security Committee, to be asked once more whether she is presently a member of the Communist Party, and thus be given an opportunity to establish her loyalty and patriotism. It will be interesting to see what her answer is.

Anyway, here is another example of the projects upon which the 15 million

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

dollars of Ford Foundation money is being spent by the Fund for the Republic, under the leadership of Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, and his swashbuckling vice president, W. H. "Ping" Ferry.

September 15, 1955

THE FUND'S PAID INFORMER, EARL BROWDER.

Mrs. Mary Knowles, the 5th amendment librarian who was fired from the Norwood Massachusetts Library for refusing to say whether she was or ever had been a communist, made another appearance before that same Senate Internal Security Committee in Washington today, and was asked the same question.

This is the young woman on whom I reported to you last night, who -- after losing her Massachusetts job -- was hired by the library of the Plymouth Meeting of Friends -- Quakers -- near Philadelphia, arousing thereby the violent protests of community leaders. When the library committee insisted, by narrow majority, in keeping her in her job despite the fifth amendment background, the Fund for the Republic -- with glowing words of praise which I quoted to you last night -- saw fit to bestow an award of \$5,000 for the courageous stand of the library committee in upholding civil liberties. Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins and Mr. W. H. "Ping" Ferry, thought the retention of Mrs. Knowles was a great performance in the public interest.

In this morning's session, Mrs. Knowles began by objecting on any questioning at all, saying that she knows nothing of national security, internal security, espionage, subversion, sabotage, infiltration, overthrow of the government, or any activities in behalf of a foreign power. Then she said:

"In view of these things, and of the fact that I am a private citizen, employed by a private organization under the care of a religious organization, I feel I have no information in the jurisdiction of this committee."

Senator Jenner of Indiana, who was acting chairman, overruled Mrs. Knowles, however, and said she must answer the questions. The Committee counsel, Jay Sourwine, informed her that Herbert Philbrick, of "I Led Three Lives" fame, told the Committee under oath, 2 years ago, that she had been a member of a communist underground cell with him in Malden, Massachusetts, and asked whether she is now a member of the party. Her reply was that she is not a member of the communist party now, and that "for many, many years I have had no connection, direct or indirect, with any organization on the Attorney General's Subversive List."

She said she does not know who applied for the \$5,000 award which the Fund for the Republic contributed, and said that it was in the nature of a pat on the back for the Library Committee, and not to help pay her salary. Sourwine finally told her that the Committee knows that as late as 1945, Mrs. Knowles

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

paid dues to the Jamaica Plain Branch of the Communist Plain Political Association, but she would not make any further comment.

So continues the case of Mrs. Mary Knowles, the 5th amendment librarian, whose case was considered by Dr. Hutchins and Mr. "Ping" Ferry to be worthy of 5 thousand dollars of money which is supposed to be spent in the general public interest and welfare. The question is whether you agree that this falls in that category.

I might mention that I have here a clipping from the Hollywood California "Citizen News," of day before yesterday -- a column by the syndicated writer Victor Riesel, who usually is entirely reliable, and this column states that Earl Browder, one-time head of the Communist Party for many years, now working for the Hutchins-Ferry Fund for the Republic, engaged on a project to study communist influence in the United States.

I find, in the official annual report of the Fund for the Republic, the following:

"Communist influence in the United States: For a study of the communist record, including bibliography, digest, and microfilms, \$64,500; For a survey of American attitudes, toward communism and civil liberties, \$185,500; For an account of communist influence, in major segments of U.S. society, \$300,000."

And inasmuch as I can find no other allocation or listing in this report, which Mr. "Ping" Ferry assured me is complete, to date, for any similar project, the natural assumption is that this is the one on which Mr. Browder reportedly has been hired. If this is not correct, I shall be happy to have Mr. Ferry provide the correct facts for me.

It certainly is conceivable that Mr. Earl Browder should be questioned, in such a study of communist influence in the United States, because he was very much a part of that influence. However, Mr. Browder has been extremely antagonistic to all questioning in the past, and has refused to answer questions of investigating committees, and to be using him as part of the machinery for working up and preparing this report, hardly reflects any light of objectivity on the ultimate result.

And incidentally, in case you missed it, the aggregate of those amounts which I listed for you, in this communism inquiry, is 450 thousand dollars of that tax-exempt Ford Foundation money, supposed to be spent in the general public welfare -- meaning in the interest of all of us. Do you feel, perhaps, that a study of communist influence in the United States, through the eyes of Earl Browder, would be an objective and unbiased project in the general public interest? Or might you feel that you don't want Mr. Earl Browder on your payroll, or to have any truck with him in any connection and for any purpose?

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

One more news item --

Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, in behalf of the Fund for the Republic, today dispatched a telegram to National Commander Seaborne Collins of the American Legion, asking for the complete mailing list of the American Legion throughout the world, so that the Fund for the Republic -- in answer to Mr. Collins' blast against the Fund last Sunday -- can mail to every one of the more than 2 million members, a copy of the annual report.

The Legion's answer was that if the Fund will provide the copies, and foot the entire cost of mailing, it itself will send them to the Legion membership. They will not be so foolish as to turn over to the Fund their mailing list.

Meanwhile, I find that in various places over the nation, the Fund is buying time immediately after this broadcast, stating that if the listeners want the facts about the Fund for the Republic, to send name and address to the headquarters, 60 East 42nd Street, New York City, and a free copy will be sent to them at the expense of the Fund.

Now this, I think, is a very excellent idea, and I want to cooperate with Mr. "Ping" Ferry and Dr. Hutchins, in full. So just in case this announcement is not carried on your station -- and even if it is -- let me urge you, just as strongly as I can, to do exactly that. send a postcard with your name and address, and ask for a copy of the free annual report, and the address is Fund for the Republic, Inc., 60 East 42nd Street, New York City.

In that way, you can have before you this report, and see the pretty words and the grandiose language, while I am explaining to you just what each item means, and what it represents, and what is really going on. This is an excellent idea.

September 16, 1955

A TV PERFORMER FOR THE FUND

Now, tonight, ladies and gentlemen, let's take a look at a new and somewhat different sort of project, which has been undertaken by the 15 million dollar Fund for the Republic, financed by the Ford Foundation out of its tax exempt money from the Ford estate. and if you happen to have a copy of the annual report of the Fund for the Republic, you'll find this listed on page 29. It says:

"In addition to direct grants to organizations, the Fund has undertaken a number of projects that are being conducted by staff members, or by persons under contract to the Fund". In other words, this project is one which the Fund for the Republic, as such, is responsible -- a project undertaken on the personal responsibility of the president, Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, and his arrogant young vice-president, the CIO Political Action Committee associate of

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

William Remington, and Lee Pressman, who has admitted his communist connections, and John Abt, who took the 5th amendment. . . . and, of course, I'm referring to W. H. Ferry, the so-called "Ping" Ferry.

Under these "projects" is listed television, and under television is listed two interesting items, of 200 thousand dollars each. The first is "For production of pilot films; for participation in television programs of interest to the Fund. . . . \$200, 000" and: "For a television series featuring Herblock. . . . \$200, 000."

Now, please keep in mind the fact that the Fund is strictly forbidden to indulge in any activities, which are directly or indirectly political, and all of its activities must be in the general public interest. In the light of that fact I shall try to find out for you what these "programs of interest to the Fund" are, and what connotations they carry -- although I think I know, as you probably do, before I ever begin looking.

About the second project, however, I am able to provide some enlightenment now. Herblock is a cartoonist -- his real name is Herbert Block -- for the extreme liberal newspaper, the WASHINGTON POST and TIMES HERALD, which has a monopoly on the highly important morning newspaper field in the Nation's Capitol. Just how a cartoonist is equipped to do a television program in which, according to advance announcements he is not even going to do any cartooning, but rather, is going to spend the time editorializing, is somewhat hazy, but that doesn't seem to matter with Mr. Robert Hutchins and Mr. "Ping" Ferry. The WASHINGTON POST is a great pet of the Fund for the Republic, and there are various grants and projects by the Fund that have been given to that newspaper.

I think some light can be thrown on the potential nature of the Herblock series, however, by a review of the past cartoons of Mr. Herblock, as they appeared in the WASHINGTON POST over the last number of years, and so I assigned a staff member to go back through the POST files in the Library of Congress, and make a symposium of those cartoons that reflected Mr. Herblock's editorial approach. Many of them are innocuous and, to be frank, dull. But others are indicative and representative. Let's go back to August first, 1948, which was the middle of the Truman-Dewey presidential campaign. This one shows three men, big, coarse, and fat. The middle one is labeled "80th Congress", and he has his arms around the shoulders of the other two, "Politics and Special interest". In the foreground is a little figure labeled "John Q. Public", who is gesturing toward a basket he holds, the basket containing bills marked "Housing, Education, and Inflation Controls". The title of the cartoon is "After all, I've only got two hands." As a reminder, those were the three chief issues on which the CIO, the Americans for Democratic Action, and the Communist Party pounded the Republicans in the '48 campaign.

August 4, 1948: a fat chuckling man labeled "Thomas Committee" (the

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

then House UnAmerican Activities Committee) is leaning out of a window. He is sending off an awkward, clumsy goofy looking girl with an idiot's face, who is grinning blankly and carrying a shot gun almost as large as she is. The title is "Have a good time, dear; get lots of publicity".

August 6, 1948: This pictures a Roman arena, which is littered with human skulls and bones. In it is a gigantic and vicious looking tiger, labeled "smear statements", and the tiger is poised, ready to pounce on a trembling, defenseless and bewildered looking man, labeled "Innocent Victims". In the balcony above, looking down over the wall, is Thomas and his Committee. He is speaking to the Innocent Victim figure, and the title is "It's perfectly fair, you can bite him right back."

September 16, 1948: A scientist is on his back on the floor with a giant-sized nail hammered through his stomach. On the floor around him is littered spilled test tubes, a microscope and so forth. On top of the head of the nail is sitting a fat, dirty-faced little man wearing a sleuth cap which is too small, and looking down at the pinned down scientist through an over-large magnifying glass. The title is "I got an interest in science".

September 20th: A shocked and surprised John Q. Public is standing in the foreground, holding a piece of paper marked "Inflation, Housing, and Education," each with a question mark. He is looking at a fat, cigar-puffing politician labeled "1948 campaign politics" who is standing by a machine (his hand operating the lever) and the machine is turning out giant size labels marked "Communist" exclamation point. The title is, "No political issues any more -- this is more efficient."

That much gives you an idea of Mr. Herblock's thinking back there..... now, the following year: This one shows Uncle Sam slumped in a chair at his desk. The room is in a shambles. There is broken furniture, broken lamps, hand and footprints are all over the walls and ceiling, bodies are strewn over the floor, and Uncle Sam has his hand over his face in exasperation. The papers on his desk in front of him read, "Results of 2, 387, 253 loyalty checks". In the middle of the room is standing a great, goofy looking idiot, labeled "Loyalty Program". He carries a smoking shotgun on one shoulder, an axe and a mallet in his ammunition belt. He is wearing the sleuth hat, too small for his head. He is grinning triumphantly, holding up his left hand, by the tail, a little dead mouse. The caption, "What next, Boss?"

That's enough for tonight..... it gives you an idea, of what this man stands for, and the same pattern holds, right on through the present time. Ridiculing congressional investigations into subversive activities, the federal security program, attempting to paint all individuals involved in security cases as innocent persecuted victims; portraying everyone involved in subversive investigations or security administration as a thug, or an idiot, or both. Always anti-Republican, but not always pro-Democrat..... only when the Democratic policy

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

is in line with the party line of the Americans for Democratic Action which, for your information, coincides very closely with the Communist Party line.

There is a systematic attack on the McCarran-Walter Internal Security Program, on Nationalist China, Spain's General Franco, and on each successive chairman of any congressional committee investigating communism.

That's Herblock, to whom Dr. Robert M. Hutchins, and his deputy "Ping" Ferry, have allocated two hundred thousand dollars for a television program this fall under the guise of "popular education".

Let me remind you again: be sure and write into the Fund for the Republic, at 60 East 42nd St. New York City, and ask for a free copy of their annual report, so that you can have it in front of you as I tell you what these items are all about, and what they really are. As I mentioned last night, the Fund for the Republic has bought time immediately following this program to tell you listeners that if you want the facts about the Fund for the Republic, write in for the annual report, and they will send it to you free of charge. That's exactly what I want you to do. . . . it's a wonderful idea. . . . then you can see this for yourself. . . . it's like a score card at a baseball game. Further information today indicates that the demand which the Fund for the Republic made on the American Legion for a mailing list to which it wants to send copies of the annual report, in reply to the attack by National Commander Seaborn Collins, last Sunday, is for a list, not of the entire Legion membership, as first reported, but of the 17 thousand Legion Posts, so the secretary of each Post would have a copy.

September 19, 1955

STANFORD ACCEPTS THE FUND'S GRANT

Stanford University's Board of Trustees, in Palo Alto, California, has accepted the \$25,000 grant from the Fund for the Republic, for the study of testimony by former communists who have been witnesses in various proceedings, but they made it very clear that the Fund for the Republic will not be permitted to exercise any influence over the study, or the results.

The President of the University said the study will be "an impartial study by legal scholars" and he continued: "In accepting this grant, about which questions have been raised by certain radio commentators and newspaper columnists, the University reaffirms that one of its chief functions is to encourage research into problems which individuals or departments within the University deem worthy of investigation. The University is concerned only that its faculty should adhere to those rigorous standards of independence of judgment, exact inquiry, and impartial evaluation of findings which have always motivated true scholars. These principles will be followed by the faculty in carrying out the research, contemplated under this grant."

Which, I suppose is all right -- except that the young attorney, Herbert

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Packer, from this city of Washington, who has been employed on another of the Fund for the Republic's projects here, designed to discredit the Governmental Security program, apparently IS going to join the law faculty of the University, and at least participate in this study. . . . and as long as the study takes place under the ultra-liberal and very political-minded Dean of the University, Carl B. Spaeth, it still is highly suspect from a realistic standpoint.

And the statement by Robert Maynard Hutchins, in announcing the grant, still stands -- that "The study will be conducted under the direction of Herbert Packer of the New York and Supreme Court bars, who will work in Washington until January, and join the Stanford law faculty on that date."

From that statement, Packer will be working on the project without any supervision at all, for the next three months.

Now, as we proceed with this investigation, ladies and gentlemen, a tremendous amount of digging, and checking and following down leads is going to be necessary, and all of this has to be done with the greatest of care, so on occasions, there will be evenings when there will be no material to present to you, and we'll just wait until the next part of the story is wrapped up and ready for you.

There are several very startling, if not shocking angles on which I am working presently. . . . it's barely possible I may have one of them for you tomorrow night. . . . if not, we'll wait until Wednesday.

September 21, 1955

"A FASCINATING DOCUMENT"

Now, I have here before me, ladies and gentlemen, a rather fascinating document with a rather fascinating story behind it. It is an 18-page document on hard white paper, stapled into the form of a large folder, and printed on hard white paper. On the front page is the title, "Report on the Security Problem", and under that, the following: "By a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate. . . . in support of Senate Joint Resolution 21, to establish a commission on Government Security". Then, at the bottom, "Reprinted from the Congressional Record, distributed by the Fund for the Republic, Inc."

For your information, this document was distributed to the Federal Judges, throughout the country, at various levels, and the date of distribution was some time after the adjournment of Congress, which was on August 2nd. There is no date on this document, nor any other way to identify it. Nor is this Committee Report signed. At the top of each of the 14 printed pages are the words "Report on the Security Problem", and the reading matter starts off without introduction of any kind, thus: "Senate Joint Resolution 21 is intended to provide, etc. . . ."

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

This document interested me, first because experience has demonstrated that anything that is distributed by the Fund for the Republic has a propaganda purpose in view, and second, because from long familiarity with the Congressional Record, there seemed to be something phony about the form of this. It was done in the same type-face as the Congressional Record, and in the same sort of column make-up, but that title line at the top, "Report on the Security Problem" is strictly out of character.

I read this report very carefully and found, buried into the body of it, a description of how the subcommittee conducted its hearings. It seems that the committee counsel invited the witnesses who appeared before it, for example, to present the point of view of American universities, the University of Chicago -- where Robert Maynard Hutchins, the president of the Fund for the Republic reigned for some 25 years -- and Harvard University.

Then it explains that in view of their special interest in phases of the security program, the Fund for the Republic and the American Civil Liberties Union were also invited to appear. In general, from there on, the report is a very critical dissertation on the evils and weaknesses of the present security system of the federal government, and a build-up for the establishment of a commission to study the subject and recommend corrections.

This attack on the security system, of course, is the constant theme of activities by the Fund for the Republic, in the course of its 15 million dollar campaign to promote the propaganda line of the Americans for Democratic Action, and other left-wing groups that have been trying to tear down the security system.

There was no Union seal on this document, and yet it clearly was not printed in the Government Printing Office, because the identifications which that agency always uses were missing.

By some rather devious tracing down of leads, I finally found, in the June 27, 1955 issue of the Congressional Record, page 7880, column three, the original of the document, and a careful examination disclosed that the reprint was a slightly enlarged replica of that original -- done either by photographic reproduction, or, perhaps, offset printing. That was demonstrated by the fact that in the body of the material, there were several printing errors, which appeared in the identical form, in both documents. For example, there is this sentence: "Senate Joint Resolution 21 would establish a 12 member non partisan commission patterns after the commission on organization, etc... -- "patterns," instead of "patterned". Then later, the words "sabotage" is spelled "sabotge" with the "a" omitted, and that error appears in both documents. So do others, all the way through.

However, a further examination shows that certain changes WERE MADE... and they were very important and significant changes. For example, in

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

preparing this material for reproduction and distribution, the pages of type in the original Congressional Record had to be cut up, and rearranged in their own column lengths, and it was after that that this title line, "report on the Security Problem" was pasted along the top of each page. . . . and, of course, the same is true of the front cover, which carries the label, "Report on the Security problem by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations, United States Senate."

But a comparison of the reproduction with the original, shows still another important change, as you will agree. The report of a subcommittee carries considerable weight, because it is the considered action of a group that has held hearings and given the subject real, immediate study and attention. So, to the Federal Judges to whom this reproduction was sent, this was an official document, with real weight.

But sadly enough, the Fund for the Republic, in making up this reproduction, under the direction of Mr. W. H. "Ping" Ferry and Company in New York (he of the old CIO Political Action Committee days in New York, with Sidney Hillman, Lee Pressman and John Abt) -- sadly enough, they failed to include some printed material that came immediately before this document, which I shall now provide for you.

This is at the end of a speech by Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota -- the extreme radical Democrat who has been the central figure in the Americans for Democratic Action, since it took over the Democratic party in 1948. He has been making some remarks on the Senate floor about this proposed commission, and the record shows that he concluded with the following:

"For a more detailed analysis of the hearings we held, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of these remarks a statement I have prepared."

The presiding officer: "Without objection it is so ordered." And then the record says: "See exhibit one". And Exhibit one begins as follows:

"Statement by Senator Humphrey: I present a statement in support of Senate Joint Resolution 21, a bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis) and myself, and unanimously supported by the Senate Committee on Government Operations." And then begins the material contained in the reprint.

In short, ladies and gentlemen, this alleged committee report, which the Fund for the Republic sent around to the Federal Judges all over the United States, and to others, is not a committee report at all, and the label is a lie. It is nothing more nor less than a statement -- not even an oral statement, read into the record -- but just a printed statement, bearing the name of Senator Hubert Humphrey, and inserted into the record by him at the close of his remarks.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

The fact is, without intending to embarrass the Senator, he didn't even write it. On the contrary, it was written by a young and obscure Washington lawyer, by the name of Herold T. Green, and I have reason to believe that Herold T. Green compiled this statement at the instigation of the Fund for the Republic, which then fed it to Senator Humphrey for insertion into the record.

Senator Humphrey's office informs me that they received a telephone call from one Adam Yarmolinsky, who they say is the Washington representative of the Fund for the Republic, and Yarmolinsky informed them that the Fund was making a reprint of this statement, and the office of Senator Humphrey made no protest.

Later, however, when they saw copies, they called attention to the fact that the labeling on the outside cover of the reprint was false and misrepresentative, and insisted that a correction be made. Under date of September 7, several weeks after I began this expose of them, the Fund sent out cards, admitting the falsification, and identifying the document as merely a statement by Senator Humphrey. All this from an organization that is forbidden to undertake any propaganda or other operations, designed to influence legislation -- for which consideration, the organization is tax free.

September 22, 1955

MR. HUTCHINS PROTESTS

Senator Joe McCarthy -- in a letter of very conciliatory tone to President Eisenhower, called on the President to assume personal leadership in the fight against the destruction of our government security program, which he said is gravely threatened. He mentioned particularly, the Fund for the Republic, which, he pointed out is headed by the President's personal friend and advisor, Paul G. Hoffman, as chairman of the Board.

He said the whole thing constitutes a political attack and conspiracy against the President's administration, and that the so-called liberal press gleefully play up selected cases in which employees have not received fair treatment, and attempt to make it appear that the entire administration of the government security program is "arbitrary, brutal and unintelligent".

He said the method used by the Fund for the Republic, in evaluating -- as they call it -- the security program, is to compile alleged employee grievances collected from the attorneys of the people involved, with no information whatsoever on the government side of the story, and publicize these to prove that the security program is a political witch-hunt.

And that is exactly correct. That is what is happening, and unless someone in a position of leadership steps in, and exposes the combined conspiracy that is in progress -- with 15 million dollars worth of Ford Foundation money to finance it, these propagandists are going to be able to begin to convince the

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

public that the whole idea of a security program is a bad thing, and thus get rid of it -- which has been their objective all along.

In the case of the Fund for the Republic, ladies and gentlemen, this organization is directing its every effort along these lines. Don't get the idea that this is some beneficent but misled venture that is just doing some silly things, and supporting some useless do-gooder projects. This is a carefully designed, heavily financed project to propagandize the political views of its leaders, notably Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, who is an actual crusader against the basic system of security clearances, or loyalty oaths, or any other restrictions of any kind, that would safeguard the country against the infiltration that our friends the British are now up in arms about.

And as his second in command, there is this ardent and dedicated individual, W. H. "Ping" Ferry, the political sidekick of Sidney Hillman and John Abt and Lee Pressman, and the rest of that ilk in the days of the Political Action Committee of the CIO.

Mr. Hutchins has just gotten through delivering himself of a speech to the American College of Hospital Administrators at Atlantic City, in which he took exception to the idea that the money in the hands of his Fund for the Republic is "your money". He said that means that detailed supervision of Foundations is necessary; that the government must see to it that your money is properly spent."

And he objects to that, if you please. This is what he says:

"If a congressional committee may follow every foundation grant and analyze the thoughts of the recipient, then Congressional Committees may follow your money when it supports preachers and teachers and seek to analyze (and control) their thoughts too.

"If a philosophical position can be treasonable, and if the majority of a congressional committee can make it so, freedom of teaching, preaching, discussion, and thought may not be with us long."

Now, just consider how dangerously clever that is. In the first place, nobody has ever suggested that a congressional committee is going to supervise the spending of money by the foundations, and Mr. Hutchins knows that perfectly well. He knows perfectly well, also, that the government -- the administrative branch -- is not going to do any "detailed supervision" as he calls it. But he also knows that the law under which his foundation exists and operates, very specifically and positively does provide that the government must see to it that the money is properly spent, and he knows also that if the government finds that he is not spending it properly -- which means in the general public welfare -- the government steps in and takes a hand as it should.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

As for his talk about whether a "philosophical position can be treasonable" -- of COURSE it can be treasonable, and anyone who questions that fact is either a knave or a fool. Treason is itself a philosophical position. . . . a point of view. . . . a purpose. . . . and it is entirely that. . . . and so far as I'm concerned, these expressions merely emphasize and illustrate just how dangerous an individual Mr. Hutchins is, to be in the position he occupies.

In connection with the operations of the Fund for the Republic, Mr. Hutchins makes this astounding statement -- in the annual report -- which may throw some light on his thinking and his general mental atmosphere.

"A political party in this country has been identified with the 'enemy'. Those associated with this party have therefore come under suspicion as an imminent danger to the State. In view of the weapons now available and of the examples of subversion that other countries have offered, the danger has seemed great, though often mysterious and intangible. It has appeared that the peril to the country could be dealt with only by methods that drastically departed from those which have characterized Anglo-American jurisprudence.

"The range of suspected persons has been enormously extended by resort to guilt by association. The evidence offered to show that a man is a danger to American institutions has often been farcically remote. The treatment accorded suspected persons in Congressional investigations and administrative hearings has not always been that contemplated by the 6th amendment. A kind of continuous propaganda and social pressure has been kept up that has tended to suppress conscientious non-conformity. Political advantage has accrued from claiming that others were indifferent to the threat of communism. The result has been that governmental officers, university presidents, and ordinary citizens have felt it necessary to exhibit inordinate anxiety on this score."

That is the philosophical foundation on which Mr. Robert M. Hutchins, and his ardent and intense crusader assistant, W. H. "Ping" Ferry are operating, in spending the 15 million dollars of the Fund for the Republic -- and he resents anybody suggesting that there should be the slightest restriction of limitation on that spending -- or that its your money and should be spent in your interest.

September 23, 1955

ADDENDA

Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, in his annual report of the 15 million dollars Fund for the Republic, financed by the Ford Foundation, says that among the recommendations the Fund has received is one for "a study of the groups on the extreme Right, in this country. The Fund has since commissioned several pilot studies on this topic."

In the list of projects, I find the following:

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"Study of extremist groups: for research and planning of a study of extremist groups, \$106,700."

Monday night, I'll have for you a report on one of these projects -- so I suggest you be sure to be on hand. It's QUITE a deal!

September 27, 1955

ADLAI STEVENSON'S PIPELINE TO THE FUND

I have here before me a dispatch which came through on the United Press wires last night, at 8:25 P.M., under a Little Rock, Arkansas dateline, which reads as follows:

"Harry S. Ashmore, executive editor of the ARKANSAS GAZETTE, announced today he will begin a leave of absence in early October, to become a personal assistant to Adlai E. Stevenson, 1952 Democratic Presidential nominee.

"Ashmore said, 'This does not necessarily mean that Governor Stevenson has made a final decision concerning his availability for the nomination.

"Ashmore said Stevenson asked him to 'assist in developing the issues for the 1956 election.' As titular head of the party, the Governor intends to take an active part in the campaign, whatever his personal role may be."

Now, I think it's a fair assumption that that indicates that Mr. Harry Ashmore, who has been a very controversial figure in Southern newspaper circles because of his extreme liberal views, is going to involve himself in direct and specific politics, in connection with the coming Presidential elections. I'm sure you agree that that is a fair statement.

Now let me read to you from the Annual Report of the Fund for the Republic, the list of Directors, with Paul G. Hoffman as Chairman of the Board:

"Harry S. Ashmore, Executive Editor, ARKANSAS GAZETTE, Little Rock, Arkansas."

Which would seem to mean that Mr. Adlai Stevenson will have a pipeline to the Fund for the Republic and its 15 million dollars of free cash from the Ford Foundation.

I rather think that Mr. Henry Ford and his son, Edsel, would be turning over in their respective graves, if they knew that the money they left, with the intent that it should be expended in the general public welfare, for the general good of the people who contributed to make it up through their purchases of Ford automobiles over the years, is being expended, instead, as it is.

And I would think also, that Mr. T. Coleman Andrews, the Commissioner of

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Internal Revenue, would be looking very carefully into this Fund for the Republic and all of its activities, to find out whether, perhaps, it is not just a political propaganda fund, devoted to influencing the coming election.

September 29, 1955

POLITICAL ACTIVITY?

From Chicago -- one that you won't like.

The organization "For America", headed by Dean Clarence Manion, formerly of Notre Dame Law School and General Robert E. Wood, head of Sears Roebuck Company, has received a letter from the Bureau of Internal Revenue, refusing to grant tax free status to it on the grounds that the organization engages in political activity. It has been active in promoting the Bricker amendment, and Commissioner Andrews' letter said the organization also has been active in a campaign to cut down government spending.

General Wood says he will appeal the ruling, pointing out that the Atlantic Union, which opposes the Bricker amendment, has been granted tax exemption, and that the amendment is not legislation anyway -- which, strictly speaking, it is not.....it is a constitutional amendment.

Maybe you can figure out how the Bureau of Internal Revenue can refuse the exemption on this organization on the one hand, and then, on the other, permit our Fund for the Republic to go ahead spending 15 million dollars on straight-away propaganda in support of the ultra liberal causes which the left-wing Democrats will use as the foundation of their presidential campaign in the next 13 months -- a constant and concentrated campaign to popularize the things which the ADA controlled wing of the Democratic Party will campaign on, from here on out.

If that's not political activity, I'd like to know.

September 30, 1955

EXPANSION

The Fund for the Republic, Inc., will open full-fledged Washington offices beginning Monday, at 1820 Jefferson Place Northwest, just off Connecticut Avenue, with Adam Yarmolinsky in charge. He is a 32 year old lawyer, whom the Fund hired to do a project called "Case Studies in Personnel Security", which is his description of some scores of government security cases which he gathered from the individuals and their attorneys, although he had no information as to what was in the government files.

So the invasion of Washington progresses to the geographical stage. That makes the philosophical invasion so much easier.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

October 3, 1955

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Now, tonight, we have a little time, and I'd like to begin introducing you to another of the operations of the Fund for the Republic, headed by Robert Maynard Hutchins, with its 15 million dollars from the Ford Foundation.

You recall that Paul Hoffman, who rates himself a friend of the President, was originally on the Ford Foundation, but was given this 15 million dollar grant for the Fund for the Republic, and moved over to that organization as its Chairman of the Board -- which he still is. Hutchins is President under him, and the ex-CIO Political Action Committee crusader, W. H. "Ping" Ferry, is Vice-President.

Robert Maynard Hutchins spends most of his time in Pasadena, California, where the living is balmy, and he has there, listed under the title "Assistant to the President", a young man named Hallock Hoffman, who is Paul Hoffman's son, no less; and young Hallock Hoffman has a very interesting background. He was married, sometime back to the daughter of a very stable and wealthy business man -- one of the top leaders on the Pacific Coast -- and young Hoffman's acquaintances in the Pasadena area say that at the time of their marriage, the families or one of them, set the two up in a very lucrative radio business which they operated for quite a while. Then, suddenly, they sold the business, and decided to devote themselves to the good of humanity. There was talk about their taking their five children to Europe, and doing their own sort of missionary work there, but they were either dissuaded in this, or decided otherwise voluntarily, because they remained in Pasadena, and Hallock Hoffman became a key figure in the American Friends Service Committee.

Now, this American Friends Service Committee is connected with the Quaker faith, and has headquarters in Philadelphia, and about ten days ago, I went there and interviewed Dr. Clarence Pickett, the retired head of the organization, and his successor, who presently is the acting head. And I have no question to pose, whatsoever, about the sincerity of these individuals, nor their right to hold the beliefs they do, nor to try to support those beliefs in practice. They are well known for their disbelief in the carrying of arms, even in defense of the country -- and that right I respect, as the law does. But sometimes, these organizations get imposed upon, without their knowledge, and I find in the Annual Report of the Fund for the Republic (or I FOUND, some weeks ago) the following listing:

"American Friends Service Committee.....a two year program of support in legal cases, to strengthen the right to freedom of conscience.....\$150,000".... a lot of money. The date of authorization is listed as last May 1, 1955.

In the body of the report, Mr. Hutchins explains this grant in the following words:

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"Among those who suffer from unusual legal difficulties, are those who conscientiously differ with prevalent practices and policies. The conscientious objector to military service does not fare well in this country; nor does the person who conscientiously objects to taking an oath, or to telling about the unpopular activities of his acquaintances." (You may note that this conscientious objection business is moving into a pretty broad field). "In order to assist CONSCIENTIOUS NON-CONFORMISTS, and to help to establish their rights, the Fund has made a grant to the American Friends' Service Committee, which will use it to obtain legal representation in cases of conscience, to litigate dubious points in the law, and to provide economic assistance to defendants in certain instances."

Now, like most of Mr. Hutchins' literature, that's very pretty talk, particularly on the surface. . . . and I hope you have your copy of this Annual Report of the Fund for the Republic, so you can read it for yourself. You'll find it on page 17, with the listing of the amount on page 24. I've done some tracing down on this particular grant of 150 thousand dollars, to find out just what it's being spent for. The trail led first to Philadelphia, of course, thence to New York, and it will lead other places, as well. Tomorrow night, I'll begin reporting actual cases for you, and I think you'll be interested to find out what this "conscientious non-conformism" means. You may have an honest difference of opinion with the American Friends Service Committee as to what conscientious objection is.

October 4, 1955

VERY PRETTY TALK

Now last night, ladies and gentlemen, I tried to lay some background for you on an organization known as the American Friends Service Committee, which received a rather unusual grant of 150 thousand dollars from the Fund for the Republic. It is listed as being for the purpose of a two year program of support in legal cases to strengthen the right to freedom of conscience, and Mr. Robert M. Hutchins, in his Annual Report, explains the project in some very fancy and highflown language.

He throws around language about freedom of conscience, and conscientious non-conformists, and the right of people to conscientiously differ with "prevalent practices and policies." He then goes on to say that in order to assist conscientious non-conformists, and to help establish their rights, the Fund for the Republic has made this 150 thousand dollar grant to the American Friends Service Committee, which will use it to obtain legal representation in cases of conscience.

I read to you last night the line about "the conscientious objector to military service does not fare well in this country". Of course, that is not true. He fares very well in this country, and did in the last war. His status is recognized and if, as a matter of legitimate conscience or religious belief he does

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

not believe in carrying arms, even in defense of his country, there are special provisions of law to handle his case. He is assigned to non-combat duty of one kind or another, which does not involve him in the military operations, and that is entirely as it should be. Many of us may not agree with his religious principles, but we recognize his right to believe in and adhere to them, and we have these special provisions for him.

This American Friends Service Committee is a sort of adjunct to the Quaker Church -- the Quakers themselves having a strong tenet that it is wrong to bear arms for any purpose. So on the face of it, this 150 thousand dollar grant for legal assistance in the cause of upholding that right of freedom of conscience looks very fine. When it comes to the rest of Mr. Hutchins' glibly worded explanation, some doubts do arise, however. To the part about the military service, he adds: "nor does the person who conscientiously objects to taking an oath, or to telling about the unpopular activities of his acquaintances."

So far as I have been able to determine, there is nothing in the Quaker religion contrary to those items, and so far as I know, there is nothing in any religion against them, except the communist religion.

The point is that I have learned from past experience that the fancy language used to explain these grants and projects, means little or nothing until you get down to the grass roots and find out exactly how the money is being spent, and what the results are there, and who the people are who are getting it. I might interject here that that is the greatest problem of this entire picture. Well meaning people of distinguished reputation are brought into these projects, and listed as members of this committee or that, and never know what is going on, really, and are dependent upon a hand-picked staff director or a consultant to the Fund for the Republic, all on the strength of some glib and flowery sounding statement of purposes, such as this one you've just heard, and their gullibility is used to lend dignity and prestige to the propaganda which the heads of the Fund for the Republic are trying to broadcast over the country, not only to the public but also to the courts, the schools, and the libraries.

The original purpose of the Ford Estate grant to the Ford Foundation was pure as the driven snow; the statement of principles of the Ford Foundation in making the 15 million dollar grant to the Fund for the Republic was unimpeachable; the statements by the Fund for the Republic about what these grants are for, which they are passing out day by day, sound wonderful. But what finally happens to the money at the action level; that's what counts; and that's what I wanted to find out in this case.

And after following this trail to Philadelphia, and interviewing the heads of the American Friends Service Committee, I went on to New York City to look over one of the grants under this 150 thousand dollar project. This is a freedom of conscience deal involving some 28 individuals who are on trial in New York State, and who presently are out on bail of 15 hundred dollars each.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

HOWEVER, it develops that the offenses with which they are charged have nothing to do with conscientious objection to bearing arms in defense of the country. Not at all. If that were the case, there'd be no quarrel. But quite the contrary, the freedom of conscience -- the conscientious non-conformism for which they are on trial in this case, is non-conformism in refusing to obey the civil defense laws of the State of New York -- specifically, in refusing to obey police orders to go into an air raid shelter, during a practice air raid in New York City last June 15.

And in one case -- that of a man named Ammon Hennacy, aged 62 and therefore old enough to know better, the non-conformism includes also the little matter of refusing to conform in the payment of income taxes over the last 12 years, on the grounds that he was protesting against military preparedness. That is a separate case against Mr. Hennacy, and the Bureau of Internal Revenue is handling that one.

The leader of this group of 28 is a woman by the name of Dorothy Day, who is the publisher of a magazine called the CATHOLIC WORKER, a very left-wing publication which of course is not any publication of the Catholic Church.

But by way of throwing further light on the event of last June the 15th, which took place at City Hall Park, New York City, Miss Day -- as representative of the group, and she was the ring leader -- called police by telephone, in advance of the air raid trial, and told them that she and her group were going to stage a demonstration at the Park, and would refuse to obey police orders to go into the shelters. Mr. Hennacy, who is editor of Miss Day's publication, said that she and he are "philosophical anarchists" and that they were disobeying a man-made law in order to obey the law of God.

When the air raid sirens blew for the test, the two of them, with the other 26 -- the group calling itself the "Resister's League" were parading in the Park with placards saying, "End war; that is the only defense against atomic weapons." They DID refuse to go to the air raid shelters when police ordered them there; they were placed under arrest -- one of them resisting physically -- and then the American Friends Service Committee came to their rescue, by providing money to finance the defense in court, on the ground of "Freedom of conscientious non-conformity."

And, let me say, this stuff about "non-conformity" and the protection of the right of the individual to be a non-conformist -- in fact, the nobility of being a non-conformist -- runs all through the Fund for the Republic programs, generally. Non-conformity is a virtue in itself. Hutchins plays it up constantly. So do the rest of the jargon throwers. No one must interfere with the non-conformist; when they do, the Fund for the Republic steps forward with its 15 million dollars from the Henry and Edsel Ford estates.

Now, it may occur to you, ladies and gentlemen, that conformism is nothing

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

but obeying the laws of the land. You can think anything you want to think -- despite the propaganda about fear in education and freedom to learn and freedom of thought that's fed out by this Fund for the Republic -- you can think anything you want to think, and do anything you want to do, and say anything you want to say, just as long as you don't violate the law. You can advocate any political theory you want, just so long as you don't preach sedition, or the overthrow of the government, and don't libel somebody else. And I'm sure you find that true of your own life. Is your freedom of thought constricted? Or your freedom of legitimate speech? Mine certainly isn't; that, I can assure you.

But under the Hutchins-Fund for the Republic thesis, this is conformism and it's a restriction of freedom of the individual. Laws are a restriction of freedom of the individual. To carry the matter to its logical conclusion, the laws against robbery or rape or murder are an abridgement of the freedom of non-conformism.

And 150 thousand dollars of money from the Ford Estate, passed to the Ford Foundation for tax evasion purposes, and from the Foundation to the Fund for the Republic, and from the Fund for the Republic to the American Friends Service Committee, and from the Friends Service Committee to the group in New York, to defend the people who put on a planned demonstration, defied what they knew to be the law, and refused to obey police orders.

Among the projects of the Fund for the Republic, ladies and gentlemen, is one about Fear in Education, and it seems that the Committee in charge of that one has sent out to some 2500 professors in colleges and schools over the country, a questionnaire, designed to sample their thinking on political matters and on the question of academic freedom.

The Committee however flatly refuses to make available a copy of that questionnaire, which leads me to request, herewith, that if some professor who hears this broadcast would be so kind as to send me his copy, I would deeply appreciate it.

A photostat or a copy will do, or I'll return the original. I think we ought to know what is in this document.

October 5, 1955

THE FORD FOUNDATION AND JURY BUGGING

Tonight, ladies and gentlemen, I want to shift your attention from the Fund for the Republic to the parent organization, the Ford Foundation, which owns 89-1/2 percent of the stock of the Ford Motor Company and represents the bulk of the Henry and Edsel Ford Estates.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

At the time the Ford Foundation was being organized, Robert Maynard Hutchins -- after some highly critical investigations of his conduct of affairs at the University of Chicago -- left that position and became an associate director of the Ford Foundation. That was in 1951. Shortly thereafter, the Ford Foundation announced a grant of 400 thousand dollars to Mr. Hutchins' University of Chicago, for studies in what they call "Behavioral Science" -- more of the lingo of these super-intellectuals. The exact language of the grant was that it was for "Behavioral Science and the Law", which probably means no more to you than it did to me, the first time I heard it. It will mean more to you, however, before this report tonight is over.

A spokesman for the University told me this afternoon that there were three projects involved, one a study of the American jury (which seems rather silly, because there is no such thing as the American jury. . . . no two juries have ever been put together, that are the same;) the second was a study of the income tax system; the third, a study of the arbitration systems, by which civil disputes are settled out of court. It is the study of the American jury, however, that is concerned in this story.

The Dean of the University of Chicago Law School, now only 44 years old and a protege and appointee of Robert Maynard Hutchins -- a Professor Edward H. Levi -- was given charge of the grant, and thus is technically responsible. He has been with the University of Chicago constantly, ever since he graduated from there in 1935, except for the war years when he was here in Washington as a special assistant to the Attorney General.

The actual conduct of the jury study, however, he turned over to one of his subordinate professors, Harry Kalven, Jr., and from September of 1954 on, the study continued under his direction, with the assistance of other lawyers, notably one Abner Joseph Mikva and Paul Kitch, and a sociologist by the name of Fred Strodebeck.

Now, with that background, the LOS ANGELES TIMES today broke a story by its Washington correspondent, Robert Hartmann, and on the basis of that, I have spent the day doing my own personal investigation, and here are the facts. And I suggest that if you're a lawyer, or know anything about the law, you take a good sedative now, before you blow your top.

Remember, this is Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins of the Ford Foundation, with a lateral pass of nearly a half million dollars to his pal and protege, back at the old Chicago Alma Mater, and this is the Robert Maynard Hutchins who is flitting all over the country, shrieking about the abuse of civil liberties, freedom from fear, academic freedom, the evils of government security system. This is the Hutchins who says he sees no real and present danger in communism, past, present or future. Also the Hutchins who berated the editors of the nation in their last convention here, climaxing his talk with these lines:

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"See the blacklist spreading in industry, merging with proposals that American communists should be starved to death. Listen to the wire-tapping.....to the cry of 'Fifth amendment communist'.....to the kept witness, roaming the land." Now for the story.

A little more than a year ago, this young professor Harry Kalven, Jr., in charge of the jury study -- together with the three assistants whom I mentioned -- went to Wichita, Kansas, and there they conferred with Federal District Judge Delmas C. Hill.

Delmas C. Hill, for your information, was appointed to the Federal bench by former President Truman in 1949, having been Democratic National Committee State Chairman for Kansas up to that time. He was among those, of course, who supported Mr. Truman's 1948 bid for the Presidency.

With the consent and approval of Judge Hill, Professor Kalven and his assistants were permitted to make a most unusual study of jury operations. Unusual to the extent that a series of civil cases was being tried in Judge Hill's court, all of them before juries, and Judge Hill permitted the Chicago University team -- not only permitted but cooperated with and assisted them -- in installing a microphone in the jury room, which microphone was connected to a tape recording machine.....and the tape recorder, if you please, was set up in the private chambers of the Judge himself.

Incidentally, two of the five cases involved were condemnation cases, in which, of course, the government had a direct interest.

Thereupon for a period of days, the Chicago University team with the help of the Judge, recorded everything that transpired in the jury room during the time they were deliberating.....their discussions, their comments, their expressions of opinion, even their personal affairs.

This, despite the fact that the secrecy of the jury room is one of the most jealously guarded sanctities of Anglo-Saxon law. But it even went further than that, because as late as this past summer, these tape recordings showed up at Estes Park, Colorado, and were played there at semi-public meetings -- which was how the story finally leaked out.

A spokesman for the University of Chicago told me this afternoon that the attorneys for both sides in the cases were aware of the fact that the jury proceedings were being recorded, which seemed, in his mind apparently, to justify the procedure. The individuals represented by those attorneys didn't know what was being done, however, and most important of all the JURY members did not know.

But in the name of a study by the self-appointed intellectuals, under Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins largesse and patronage, their deliberations and

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

conversations were recorded, nonetheless.

In the course of my reportorial investigation this afternoon, I talked with Attorney General Herbert Brownell, who said that his Department of Justice has started a complete and thorough investigation of the incident, and that such a thing seems incredible to him. He said further, and more important, that immediately upon the convening of the next session of Congress, he will ask Congressional leaders to pass legislation to stop up this loophole in the fabric of justice so that no repetition of such a thing can ever happen again. Specifically, he will ask Congress to make it a crime to eavesdrop on any federal jury, either directly or indirectly, in person or by mechanical contrivance. There is more immediate action in sight, however.

Counsel Jay Sourwine, for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, informed me that he will begin a complete investigation of the jury tapping case immediately, with hearings to be held early next week, and he will bring on the witness stand all persons who were involved in the affair, although it has not been decided as yet whether it will be in open or closed session.

Senator James Eastland, Democratic Chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, and formerly an outstanding attorney in Mississippi, issued the following statement:

"If the sanctity of the jury room was violated, in this case, as reports reaching the Subcommittee indicate it was, I consider it one of the greatest blows ever struck at the integrity of our judicial system.

"Any lawyer connected with such a reprehensible scheme deserves the severest censure, in my opinion. The basis of our jury system is complete independence of the jurors, in both their thinking about the case and in discussion among themselves, of the evidence that has been laid before them. To preserve this independence, jurors must be absolutely sure that no one is listening in, and that no record is made of anything that goes on in the jury room.

"The preservation of the integrity of our judicial system is of great importance to the internal security of the United States, and if there has been any attempt to undermine the jury system, we are going to find out about it. If we discover that an incident of this nature did occur, and that such things can be done without legal liability, under the present state of the law, we shall certainly recommend whatever legislation may be necessary, to insure that anyone who so violates the sanctity of the jury room in the future will find himself in violation of the law, as well as in violation of professional ethics and good taste."

That is a statement by Senator James O. Eastland of Mississippi, Chairman of the Senate Internal Security Committee.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

There are various cases on record, dealing with the general subject of the sanctity of the jury room, but one particularly seems to be apropos, a case of McDonald versus Pless, which went to the Supreme Court. It involved the question of whether a juror would testify, afterwards, as to what went on in the jury room, the claim having been made that the method of reaching their decision had been, on this occasion, both arbitrary and unfair. One of the jurors was prepared to testify, but the Judge refused to permit him to do so, and the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the ruling, the essential part of the decision reading as follows:

"If evidence thus secured could be thus used, the result would be to make what was intended to be a private deliberation (by the jury), the constant subject of public investigation -- to the destruction of all frankness and freedom of discussion and conference (in the jury room.)

"For, while it may often exclude the only possible evidence of misconduct, a change in the rule 'would open the door to the most pernicious arts, and tampering with jurors.' The practice would be replete with dangerous consequences. It would lead to the grossest fraud and abuse and no verdict would be safe."

And that, mind you, was in reference to a case in which a litigant was seeking justice. Mr. Hutchins and his boys -- with the 400 thousand dollars of Ford Foundation money behind them -- were just on a fishing expedition, to try to find out what makes the American jury tick, and what its "Behavioral characteristics" are.

The headquarters of the Ford Foundation in New York said tonight that it had made the grant to the University of Chicago, but that it has nothing to do with directing the work that is done, and has no control over the project."

All very fine -- but don't forget that the Ford Foundation gave 15 million dollars to the Fund for the Republic, which again is being directed and dispensed by Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, and it has no control over that, either.

This is getting to be something of a habit.

October 6, 1955

MORE ON THE JURY BUGGING

By way of following up on the report I made to you last night, disclosing the tape recorder that was planted in the jury room of a federal court in Wichita, Kansas, by a project of the Ford Foundation, there are various developments today, including an official statement by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., which is quite positive in its language. He said:

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"We in the Department of Justice are unequivocally opposed to any recording or eavesdropping on the deliberations of a jury, under any conditions, regardless of purpose. I will ask Congress for a law to prevent any such intrusions upon jury privacy by any persons whomsoever and by any means whatsoever."

He went on to say that the tape recordings were made without the knowledge or consent of the Department of Justice or the Attorney General, and that "such practices, however well intentioned, obviously and inevitably stifle the discussion and free exchange of ideas between jurors." He said that eavesdropping is clearly inconsistent with the seventh amendment to the constitution, which provides that trial by jury must be preserved.

This afternoon, the American Civil Liberties Union issued a statement in the name of the Executive Director, Patrick Murphy Malin, expressing shock over the incident, and stating the "complete opposition of that organization to any kind of invasion of the privacy of the jury in any court." They said it is immaterial whether the attorneys and the judge approved or not; that even if the jurors themselves knew that their deliberations were being recorded, the process is indefensible, and added: "Any destruction of the privacy of jury deliberations is bad, even in the form of a jurors comments, after the verdict is rendered. The destruction is all the worse, when it is officially sanctioned, and uses a method closely akin to wiretapping."

The press associations today carried statements from the University of Chicago, purporting to come from Professor Harry Kalven, of the Law School, which is conducting this 400 thousand dollar project for the Ford Foundation, defending the tape recorder eavesdropping performance on the ground that the Judge, and all of the attorneys involved, including the United States District Attorney who was directly involved in two of the cases, gave their approval.

Having a few years of experience in dealing with people and projects of this kind, I like to be sure that all of these statements that are tossed out so glibly are strictly accurate, so I made it my business today to find out just who the United States District Attorney for that Kansas District was, in May of 1954, when the jury tapping scandal actually took place.

I found that it was a Mr. George Templar, who no longer holds the post, and is practicing law in Arkansas, Kansas. In reply to a question by long distance telephone, Mr. Templar told me this afternoon that he had no knowledge of the recordings at all, and he did not give his approval. However, the individual on his staff who was personally in charge of affairs in the Federal Court in Wichita (Templar's headquarters were in Topeka), was an assistant by the name of William E. Farmer, who now is full District Attorney for that circuit.

I contacted Mr. Farmer, now in Washington for a Justice Department conference, and Mr. Farmer said he definitely did not give his approval or consent,

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

knew nothing about the recordings being made at the time, and never found out about them until a year later.

So much for the University of Chicago statement. And these people are entrusted with a 400 thousand dollar grant by the Ford Foundation, supposedly in the public interest.

Now, in the meantime, it occurred to me that it would be enlightening to know something about the background of these individuals -- Edward Levi, the Dean of the University of Chicago Law School who is actually responsible for the conduct of the so-called study of "Behavioral Sciences and the Law -- and his subordinate professor, Harry Kalven, who is in direct charge of it, and who arranged for the jury-bugging performance in Wichita. (That "Behavioral Sciences" business gets under my skin, anyway. . . . did you ever hear such a lot of hogwash!)

As I reported to you last night, Levi is strictly an academic lawyer, only 44 years old at the present time, a protege and appointee in his present position, of Robert Maynard Hutchins who now is head of the Fund for the Republic, and who was on the Ford Foundation when the 400 thousand dollar grant was made in 1952.

Levi, it develops, did one short turn as counsel for a notorious Congressional investigation, headed by Representative Emanuel Celler of New York, the purpose of which was to try to smear industry and business through a purported "monopoly investigation".

As for Kalven, he is a youngster who is on record in the official communist newspaper, the DAILY WORKER, as having signed an open letter to the President, urging clemency for the Rosenbergs in 1952, and he wrote, recently, an article which appeared in the September 1954 issue of the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," the chairman of the board of sponsors of which is Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, the article being a vigorous defense of Oppenheimer and an attack on the security system of the government, in general. The article, incidentally, was favorably mentioned in the book, "I Accuse", by Stewart and Joseph Alsop, which itself was a defense of Dr. Oppenheimer.

Those are the individuals to whom the Ford Foundation gives 400 thousand dollars for an investigation of the "Behavioral Sciences and the Law," and sends them on their merry way to hide microphones with tape recorders in Federal jury rooms.

Of course, the Ford Foundation says that it has no control over what is done with these moneys, once they are granted, and, in the manner in which the Foundation makes these grants, that may be true. It certainly is not true, necessarily, however, and these cases -- including the case of the Fund for the Republic as a whole -- demonstrate just how bad the system is. If that is to be

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

the basis on which the Ford Foundation grants are made, then it behooves the Ford Foundation to be very sure, in advance, as to exactly who the people are they are dealing with. They obviously were not sure in this Chicago University grant, and they obviously were not at ALL sure in the case of the Fund for the Republic. In both instances, they allowed Robert Maynard Hutchins, who hardly could be considered to be a stable, normal thinking American citizen as we know the average loyal American, to go off on his own peculiar left wing tangents, and, in the case of the Fund for the Republic, to spend 15 million dollars in public money on a series of completely slanted propaganda projects, which do not even purport to consider but one side of the questions involved. That is the astounding part of this whole crazy business. . . . the utter gall with which this whole rig is operated. The projects are biased, the people who conduct them are biased, the material that is produced is biased, and yet they are turned out to be used by the public and by lawyers and by educators, who supposed them to be legitimate. This is stacking the libraries and the record and even history. And 15 million dollars from the Ford Foundation is paying for it.

In Illinois, the State Executive Committee of the American Legion has officially repudiated any connection with the 50 thousand dollar grant from the Fund for the Republic, which was to be for some sort of joint adult education project with an outfit which calls itself the American Heritage Council -- about which I reported to you some weeks ago, and adopted a resolution which said that the committee "repudiates and disowns any support of the American Heritage Council, the Ford Foundation or the Fund for the Republic, or any of its programs." About a week ago, the powerful Chicago council of the Legion, representing the posts in the greater Chicago area, adopted a similar resolution. In short, the Legion in Illinois wants no part of any money from the Ford Foundation or the Fund for the Republic. In Idaho, the Legion has just demanded that the University of Idaho cancel a speaking engagement which Robert M. Hutchins is scheduled to make there, with the following statement:

"Hutchins public utterances and testimony before Congressional Investigating Committees have indicated that he and his associates are trying to propagandize Americans into believing that communism never has been and is not now a serious threat to this country, and that sinister forces under the pretext of fighting communism are the real danger and threat to the civil liberties of Americans."

As an added note to this jury room "bugging" story, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has just announced that it has issued subpoenas for a public hearing here in Washington next Wednesday. Those subpoenaed include Dean Levi, Professor Kalven and three other men who worked with Kalven on the bugging incident.

October 7, 1955

THE "IMPARTIAL" MR. HUTCHINS

Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins, head of the Fund for the Republic, receives an award here in Washington tonight from the left-wing American Veterans Committee, and he will repeat to the banquet in his honor, a speech which he made recently in Los Angeles, which contains some interesting -- if somewhat dubious -- statements.

He says, for example, that "people who fear an impartial investigation of the government's loyalty-security program, do so because they are afraid of the truth".....a curious twist for several reasons, though quite typical of the wily wording for which Mr. Hutchins is renowned. He added that they are afraid the positions they have taken and the reputations they have built, may appear defective.

The normal person would say: "People who fear the government's loyalty-security program, do so because they are afraid of the truth." Which is perfectly logical. Noting the source of all of this persistent propaganda to destroy the loyalty-security program, there is no possible doubt in the mind of any fairminded person that that IS the fact.

But the interesting angle is Mr. Hutchins' insertion of the word "impartial"people who fear an impartial investigation of the Government's loyalty-security program.

Nobody has ever objected to an impartial investigation of the loyalty-security program, so far as I know. I certainly have no objection to it. But the implication by Mr. Hutchins' remarks is that the Fund for the Republic investigations are impartial, and he knows as well as he knows his own name that they are not impartial, and they were not intended in the beginning to be impartial. He knows that HE is not impartial, and that every project that has been undertaken by the Fund for the Republic, since it got its 15 million dollar grant from the Ford Foundation, has had a very clear-cut objective in mind, as to what the investigation was going to produce, and the result in those investigations concerning the loyalty-security program was to be that the program would appear evil, unfair, violative of rights of the individual, unnecessary, costly, and as heinous as facts or imagination could be twisted to make them appear.

Every publication that the Fund for the Republic, under Mr. Hutchins' deft handling with the help of his side-kick, W. H. "Ping" Ferry -- late of the CIO Political Action Committee -- has had the same taint. Listen to these, from the annual report of the Fund for the Republic itself:

"Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" -- Special issue on loyalty-security, 25,000 copies. (This was the issue devoted entirely to a harangue against the loyalty-security program and how unfair it had been to Dr. J. Robert

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Oppenheimer, and to a general glorification of Oppenheimer himself.)

"Cornell Series in Civil Liberties".

"Faceless Informers And Our Schools", 25 thousand copies.

"Government By Investigation," 850 copies.

"Grand Inquest", by Telford Taylor -- who is banned from government service because of uncleared up security questions -- 450 copies.

That is the full list of distributed publications by Mr. Hutchins' Fund for the Republic, having to do with loyalty-security programs in the government, and I'll leave it to you as to whether that sounds very impartial. Nothing on the other side. The biggest project the Fund has completed thus far is a so-called study of the loyalty security program, by a group of selected cases, done by a young lawyer by the name of Adam Yarmolinsky, who as of last Monday was set up here in Washington in charge of the Washington office of the Fund. The cases are so selected as to make them tell a story of unfair burden on the individuals, and he admits in the preface that he does not have any facts from the government side of these stories, because he could not get access to the files. But this, says Mr. Hutchins, is an impartial investigation. More, next Monday.

Representative Kenneth Keating of New York, high-ranking member of the House Judiciary Committee, told me this afternoon he will demand a full investigation of the "bugging" of a federal court jury room by a team of lawyers from the University of Chicago operating under a \$400,000 grant from the Ford Foundation, to get all details of the incident with a view to determining whether impeachment proceedings should be undertaken against the judge who gave his consent to planting the hidden microphone in the jury room.

October 10, 1955

MR. SOKOLSKY, THE S. A. R. AND
THE AMERICAN LEGION

Getting back to Miami, the American Legion there is going to have placed before it in these next few convention days, a resolution condemning the Fund for the Republic and its activities, in effect supporting the recent statement of the National Commander Seaborn Collins, warning all Legion posts to have no truck with the Fund for the Republic or any of its activities or agencies and charging that the real purpose of the Fund for the Republic with its 15 million dollar grant from the Ford Foundation is not to get the truth about the things it is purporting to investigate in the name of civil liberties but rather to discredit and destroy the entire government loyalty security program and bring the operation of that program to an end. There also will be a demand on Congress to investigate the Fund for the Republic and the Ford Foundation and possibly some other foundations to determine whether they are legitimately tax exempt or whether perchance they are really one-sided propaganda projects with subversive political intent. And my informants within the Legion tell me that they

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

have every expectation of seeing those resolutions passed by heavy majorities.

In the meantime, the Board of Trustees of the Sons of the American Revolution met in Washington on Saturday night and unanimously adopted a resolution, quite a lengthy one, in connection with the case which I reported to you last Wednesday -- the case of the University of Chicago team of law professors who, with a four hundred thousand dollar grant from the Ford Foundation, bugged the jury room of the Federal Court in Wichita, Kansas, and recorded the deliberations of the jury in five consecutive cases. The resolution by the Sons of the American Revolution states that the sanctity of the grand jury or petty jury rooms is one of the foundation stones of our liberties and that breaking down that sanctity would be a severe threat to our national security. It then states that the organization deeply deplores the action of the Ford Foundation and its acting director at the time, Robert M. Hutchins, assistant director really, in making this grant to the University of Chicago, and it deplores also the action of that law school, the federal judge who gave his approval to the bugging and the professors who conducted the jury tapping for their conduct of the so-called study. The resolution calls upon Congress for a thorough investigation of the matter and if it develops that some law has been violated, the impeachment of the judge in question -- Federal Judge Delmas C. Hill. It said that if there is no such law, the immediate enactment of one should be made in order to prevent a recurrence of this affair in the future.

In the meantime, Mr. George Sokolsky, my very distinguished colleague in New York, issued a statement about an approach that has been made to him by one Ralph Lord Roy of the Union Theological Seminary in New York who is making a Fund for the Republic study of communism in religion. It seems that Mr. Roy wrote a letter to George Sokolsky asking for an interview with him to discuss the subject of his investigation and this today was a copy of George Sokolsky's answer. This is in the form of a letter and it says: "Dear Mr. Roy -- Neither this League, the American Jewish League Against Communism, nor any of its officers will cooperate with the Fund for the Republic or any of its agencies because we are satisfied that up to the present time, the Fund for the Republic is not investigating communism in American life without bias and that its bias can be described as anti anti-communism to which we are as opposed as we are to communism itself. You say that you wish to discuss 'the subject as it relates to our common interest.' I am sure that we have no common interests with the Fund for the Republic." Signed George Sokolsky, President of the American Jewish League Against Communism.

October 11, 1955

A DEFENSE OF JURY BUGGING!

In Miami, the Legion convention is still in its opening stages, with most of the activity underway in committees, the reports to be made to the convention as a whole later on, but there may be some action beginning tomorrow. There has been quite a furor within the Legion locally, in Florida, over a proposal

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

that the Florida Department cooperate with another one of the Ford Fund for the Republic ventures, but apparently, it will not find its way to the floor of the national convention. The State Commander, who is in favor of the venture, has said that he can't be concerned with the controversy until after the national convention is over.

There is no question, however, but that the Fund for the Republic controversy - and the Ford Foundation itself -- will reach the floor in the form of resolutions of condemnation -- probably presented by the Committee of Americanism.

Now, I have some follow-up developments tonight, ladies and gentlemen, on the case of the planted microphone and the tape recorder in the jury room of the Federal Court in Wichita, Kansas. This one involves the WASHINGTON POST which, to my surprise, joined the ranks of most of the other newspapers of the nation in a strong editorial stand of censure of the incident, on the grounds that it jeopardizes the future of the whole jury system.

There appeared today on the editorial page of that newspaper, in the area blocked off for correspondence from subscribers, a letter which is too long-winded to read, but which takes head-on exception to the POST editorial, and stating that there is "not the slightest jeopardy to the jury system as an institution" by bugging the jury room, and that on the contrary, "the vitality of the jury as an institution depends upon informed understanding and criticism."

The letter said that the writers consider it faulty analysis, to compare the jury-bugging to wire tapping, because the purpose of it is to improve the administration of justice, and the purpose of wire-tapping is to obtain information or leads for use in criminal prosecutions -- the inference being that the latter is wrong, and the former is quite all right. And the letter concludes with a general defense of the jury bugging process, and of those who were involved in the actual Wichita instance of it.

It may have struck you as amusing that this process of vitalizing the jury process of tape-recorder eavesdropping on the deliberations of a jury in five consecutive cases, should be in the tender hands of an individual who is on record as having signed an open petition to the President of the United States in behalf of the Rosenbergs, and who likewise spoke at a fund raising dinner in behalf of the Rosenbergs, but we can pass that up.

The interesting point about this letter is the signatures at the bottom. . . . they are: Herold Green and Abe Krash. . . . which, I'm sure, means nothing to you at all.

But for your edification, Herold Green is none other than the young Washington lawyer who actually wrote the document which Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota put into the Congressional Record on the subject of the loyalty-

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

security program in the government, and how evil and unfair it is. . . . that was the phony which the Fund for the Republic distributed in huge numbers, at your expense, after reprinting it with a phony label saying that it was a committee report of the United States Senate. Actually, it not only was not a report -- it was not even a speech by Senator Humphrey, and it was not even written by Senator Humphrey. This Herold Green wrote it, and Humphrey merely inserted it into the Congressional Record by unanimous consent. So much for Mr. Herold Green.

Abe Krash, for your further information, is listed as being with the New Deal ultra-liberal law firm of Thurman Arnold, Abe Fortas, and former OPA director Paul Porter, which firm has been perhaps the most active of all Washington groups in their attacks on the loyalty-security program of the government, and in their defense of government employees on security charges.

It might be added, also, that both are graduates of the same University of Chicago Law School, which conducted the jury-bugging adventure.

Incidentally, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, under Senator Eastland of Mississippi -- a Democrat, of course -- will bring the entire team of University of Chicago professors and instructors, who conducted the Wichita grand jury tapping operation, into an open hearing tomorrow morning to get to the bottom of the affair, and the hearings may take several days. . . . my associate Russell Turner will cover them in person for you, and I'll pass the information on to you tomorrow night. The delegation, shall we say, from the University of Chicago is headed by the Dean of the Law School, Edward H. Levi, to whom the 400 thousand dollar grant of the Ford Foundation for this project was made, and who thus is responsible; the professor who was immediately in charge of the operation, Harry Kalven, Jr., and the three professors who assisted him in the actual work, Abner J. Mikva and Paul Kitch of the Law Faculty, and Fred Strodebeck, of the Sociology Faculty of the University.

Also under subpoena are three figures from the office of the United States District Attorney for the Wichita court -- the then District Attorney George Templar, who says he knows nothing about the incident; his then assistant and later successor, William Farmer, who says the same thing; and Robert Cowger, an assistant to Farmer who thus far has not said anything.

After tomorrow, the subcommittee will decide where to go from there -- notably, whether to call the Federal Judge involved.

October 12, 1955

THE SENATE INTERNAL SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE LOOKS AT JURY BUGGING

In Washington, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee with Chairman James Eastland of Mississippi, and Republican Senator William Jenner of

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Indiana present began open hearings on the jury bugging incident in the Federal Court in Wichita, Kansas, and it developed some very astonishing information.

This is the case which I reported to you last Wednesday -- one week ago today, involving the project of the University of Chicago for a study of jury procedure in the courts, financed by 400 thousand dollars from the Ford Foundation. Mind you, this is not the Fund for the Republic; this is the Ford Foundation, the parent organization, but it was made when Robert Maynard Hutchins was an associate director of the Ford Foundation, so his little pink fingers are in on it just the same.

Both Senators Eastland and Jenner opened the hearing today with brief statements, the former stating that the purpose of the inquiry is to determine whether the tape recording of the deliberations of a jury threatens to undermine the integrity of the jury system, and he added that the Committee has been criticized in some quarters for devoting too much time to communism and subversive activities. The case at hand, he said, involves neither one, but nevertheless certainly involves the question of internal security.

Senator Jenner said he feels strongly that the effect of the jury bugging may be to impair free deliberation within the jury room.

The first witness was Edward H. Levi, Dean of the University of Chicago Law School, to whom the 400 thousand dollar grant was made, and he said that he was the active director of the jury study project at the time of the Wichita affair, although later he turned the project over to Professor Harry Kalven, jr.

He said the idea of the eavesdropping act with tape recorder originated with a lawyer named Eugene Stanley, and that his own first reaction to it was that it probably could not be arranged. However, with the help of a Wichita attorney named Paul Kitch, arrangements were made to lay the plan before the senior judge of the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals, which includes Kansas Judge Orrie Phillips, and the Judge agreed on the provision that the recordings would be kept confidential, and that no identification of jurors or cases would be revealed.

Judge Phillips later called for the tapes and had them played last May at a summer resort in Colorado. After the senior judge approved, Dean Levi said he and his team went to Wichita, where they saw Federal Judge Delmas P. Hill, who cooperated with them in having the hidden microphone installed in the jury room, without the knowledge of the jurors, connecting the mike with a recorder in the Judge's personal chambers.

Levi is a medium built man with dark brown hair, balding on top, with horn rimmed glasses and an olive complexion. He said he wanted to find out, in these studies, to what extent juries understand the cases they are considering; what possibilities are of speeding up jury considerations; how they operate in

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

general, and anything else he might learn. Senator Eastland suggested that all such information could easily be determined by interviewing actual jurors after they have decided real cases, and Levi admitted that was possible.

Counsel Jay Sourwine asked if this is the only case of jury bugging that the project has attempted, and he said he thinks it is. Frankly, for your own information, I have very good reason to believe that that is not true, and that there were numerous others; and the Assistant Attorney General of the United States in charge of the Civil Rights Division, in a speech in Minnesota today is reported to have stated that the Chicago Law School project planned to carry out more than 500 of these jury bugging projects.

Levi's assistant, Professor Harry Kalven testified later that this is not true, and that the Assistant Attorney General, Warren Burger, doesn't know what he's talking about. He insisted, however, that this was the only project planned. Under cross-examination by Counsel Sourwine, he admitted however, that they may have planned to do some jury bugging later, but that, he said, would be a long time off -- to which Senator Eastland commented that it would, on the contrary, not be AT ALL, because Congress will pass legislation to forbid any more of it. Eastland said to Levi: "You violated the sanctity of the jury room, did you not?" Levi replied, "I did not; the judge agreed to what was done."

Sourwine questioned Levi at considerable length about what the four hundred thousand dollar grant was for, and Levi said it was to be divided into three parts....the major portion of it was to be used for the jury study, a smaller share was to go for a study of out-of-court arbitration procedures, and still a smaller part was to be used to study the income tax picture. He said, on cross-examination, that the amount already spent on the jury study to date is something in excess of 200 thousand dollars, and that the University intends to continue the project for about four years more.

At that point, Sourwine said: "Well, in that event you'll have to get more money, won't you?" -- to which the witness replied, "No, that won't be necessary". Sourwine said he couldn't reconcile the mathematics of the matter, and then Levi explained:

"This has not been announced as yet, but in August the Ford Foundation made us an additional grant of one million dollars, in addition to the four hundred thousand."

Under further questioning, Levi said that before the new grant was made by the Ford Foundation, he informed a representative of the Foundation of the jury bugging incident, and additionally informed the Foundation, by letter, of the details of what had been done. The representative of the Foundation he identified as Bernard Berrelson who, he admitted, was formerly a member of the Law Faculty of the University of Chicago, before going with the Foundation.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Sourwine then told the committee that Berrelson's record shows that he was a member of the welcoming committee for the Red Dean of Canterbury, in 1945 under the auspices of the Council of American Soviet Friendship, listed by the Attorney General as communist and subversive, and Levi admitted that from the 1930's until the early 1940's when he was in Washington with a job in the Department of Justice in the anti-trust division, he was a member of the National Lawyers Guild, cited as the foremost legal bulwark of the communist party. He lost interest then, and stopped active participation.

So this Mr. Berrelson and the Foundation generally knew about the jury eavesdropping, and granted an additional million dollars to the project anyway.

Levi insisted that the information contained in the tapes has been kept in the strictest secrecy, and never discussed or divulged to anybody by himself or by Professor Kalven, and was very positive on this point. However, I have before me a weekly luncheon schedule for the Chicago Chapter of the University of Chicago Alumni Association, and I note the following, listed for Wednesday November 2, 1955: "How Jurors Think" -- some interesting experiences in the Law School's intimate study of how juries reach verdicts. . . . by Professor Harry Kalven, Jr., director of this research project.

You can draw your own conclusions.

Kalven himself followed Levi on the stand -- a small slight man with black hair and olive skin -- and said that he was a friend of Robert Maynard Hutchins. He insisted that he has no further plans for jury bugging, and that this is the only case he knows about.

He admitted under cross-examination that he wrote a personal letter to President Truman, protesting the conviction of the Rosenbergs, but that until he heard over this broadcast last night about another mass petition in defense of the Rosenbergs which he signed, he had not remembered doing so. When he was shown a photostatic copy of the DAILY WORKER, listing his name among the signatures he admitted having authorized the signature. He also admitted that he agreed to speak at a fund raising dinner by the Committee to Secure Justice for the Rosenbergs, but said he was unable to be present, at the last minute, so he had his wife go in his place, and read his prepared speech. All this was in 1952 and 1953. Also, he admitted speaking in defense of the Rosenbergs at some campus meetings at the University.

One of the lawyers, in one of the five cases that were recorded in Wichita, was put on the witness stand, and testified that he and opposition counsel were called to the chambers of Judge Hill, just before the case began, and asked whether they had any objection to what had been proposed. He said he didn't think much about it, because he was wrapped up in the problem of selecting the jury, and trying to win a law case, and he said it was all right with him. Counsel Sourwine said he had contacted other attorneys involved, and the same

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

thing seemed to be true in all their cases.

In the meantime, in Miami, the American Legion in National Convention adopted some resolutions. The first called on Congress to make a complete investigation of all tax exempt foundations -- the United Press stating that this was another blow at the controversial Fund for the Republic. They also repudiated, by a thundering roar, the favorable Murphy report on UNESCO, and restated the previous Legion position in violent censure of that organization. The resolution calls on Congress to withdraw from UNESCO at once, and put the entire Federal Government on a blackout basis, so far as any dealings, co-operation or activities of the UNESCO are concerned.

They also, I might add, adopted a resolution commending Fulton Lewis, Jr., George Sokolsky, Paul Harvey Constantine Brown, Victor Riesel and Earl Godwin, for their faithful and courageous exposures of the dangers of communism and subversion.

October 13, 1955

IMPEACHMENT?

We seem to be getting fast action on the incident which I reported to you first on Wednesday evening of last week -- a week ago yesterday -- regarding the hidden microphone which was planted, with the Judge's permission, in the jury room of the Federal Court in Wichita, Kansas, to the extent that after two days of open hearings the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, late this afternoon, voted to turn the record over to the House Judiciary Committee for its consideration regarding possible impeachment proceedings.

The word impeachment was not used, but the function of the House Judiciary Committee is to originate impeachments, and a joint statement -- put out by Senator James Eastland of Mississippi, the Chairman of the Subcommittee, and Senator William Jenner of Indiana (the two of them constituting a majority of the membership) excoriated the entire project, including the University of Chicago, the Ford Foundation, the attorneys involved and the Federal Judge who gave his approval.

And this, only eight days after the story of the jury bugging was first broken to you over this microphone, after picking up the clue to it from the Los Angeles Times.

There were various new witnesses before the Committee today, including the two individuals who actually made the recordings, one of them being a Wichita attorney who said he sold the project to Dean Edward H. Levi of the Chicago University Law School -- a man named Paul A. Kitch, who said he talked to numerous Federal Judges about the idea, in advance, and that he gathered that all except one of them was sympathetic. The one critic, he said, was Federal Judge John J. Parker, of North Carolina.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

In the course of today's testimony it developed that the group before which the tapes were played back later consisted of a group of about 100 people at Estes Park, Colorado, last May, including about 20 judges, Supreme Court Justice Tom Clark, and the Solicitor General of the United States Simon E. Sobelov. The person who operated the playback machine was Fred Strodebeck, Professor of Sociology at the University of Chicago, and a member of the team that conducted the project. Kitch said his original plan was to make between 500 and 1,000 of these secret recordings of jury deliberations to get a broad sample.

He defended the project vigorously, and told the members of the Subcommittee that they "lose the touch", and that the jury system in America has suffered from gradual "lack of confidence". That may be news to you; it certainly seemed to be news to the Senators.

Among the more astounding bits of new information brought out today was that the Chicago University bugging team, although they contended stoutly, yesterday, that the identity of the individual jurors and the identity of the cases were to be strictly anonymous, -- went to each individual member of the jury after the cases were decided and "by special techniques and later interviews" identified every jury member and everything he said in the deliberations.

Strodebeck said that in the actual recording process the microphone was disguised as part of the heating system of the room, and the recorder was hidden in a closet off the Judge's chambers, and was operated by Strodebeck.

On the occasion of the Estes Park playback, the tapes were condensed by editing, and from the time they were made until the present, as many as ten different individuals have had access to them.

Attorney Kitch said that Judge Roy Savage and Judge Stephen S. Chandler, both of Oklahoma City, gave permission for the jury rooms to be bugged, and he thinks that Judge William R. Wallace of the same bench did likewise. The other member of the operating force which made the tapes was Abner Joseph Mikva, of Chicago.

Now, in the interest of accuracy, I think perhaps I'd better read the joint statement of the two Senators verbatim, because it is, in effect, a judgment on the basis of the information that has been produced before them in the past 48 hours. It's a little long, but I'd rather give it to you in full than risk any interpretations on my part, so here goes:

"The facts revealed before the Internal Subcommittee in two days of hearings on the 'bugging' of the deliberations of certain juries on civil cases in the Federal District Court in Kansas, would be almost unbelievable if they had not been the subject of testimony under oath.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"What was done in this Kansas Court constituted, in our separate judgments, a flagrant abuse of authority, a violation of the constitutional guarantee under the 7th amendment of the right of trial by jury, and a serious threat to such right for the future so long as there is no guarantee that incidents of this nature will not again occur.

"We believe the best way to provide such a guarantee, so far as the Federal Courts are concerned, is by the enactment of legislation making it a crime to eavesdrop on the deliberations of a jury or to record such deliberations in any way.

"We consider beside the point, the claim that this violation of the sanctity of the jury room was intended for research purposes only, and that efforts were made to keep the whole matter a closely-held secret. The impossibility of achieving success in such efforts has been well demonstrated by the way in which the facts have been shown to have leaked out in this case. Furthermore, it seems obvious that if there was no intention ever at any time to make public use of the material obtained by recording the juries' deliberations, there was no reason for arranging these recordings at all.

"We consider it immaterial also whether this eavesdropping on juries was done with the consent of judges or lawyers. Perhaps it could not have been done so readily without such consent. But that it was done at all, and that it has become known it was done, is what poses the threat to free deliberation in all subsequent cases. A juror must know that within the walls of the jury room he may speak freely, if his true and proper function as a juror is to be performed. This is a right which may not be transgressed by either attorneys or judges; it rests on a constitutional guarantee.

"We were appalled to learn, through testimony before us, of the extensive steps taken by the University of Chicago representatives to learn the exact identity of each juror whose deliberations were recorded, and to establish exactly what each juror said. That such a record was made at all, and that this record has been carefully preserved, is one of the most reprehensible aspects of this whole matter.

"In a situation such as this, where the freedom of jury deliberation has been tampered with, where the very integrity of the jury system has suffered a severe blow, it was important to know who was responsible and, if possible, why. The Committee has sought answers to these questions.

"The jury system is a fundamental of our judicial structure and is basic to a free society under law as we know it. If the jury system is destroyed, or substantially weakened, a bitter blow will have been struck at the liberties of the people.

"That a grant of tax-free dollars should have contributed towards under-

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

mining freedom of jury deliberations, raises the question of what is the fundamental purpose of a Foundation. That the original grant was augmented by a second grant two and one-half times as large, after the facts of what has been done to invade the privacy of juries had been made known to officials of the Ford Foundation, raises the question of whether that Foundation has gone beyond the proper bounds of any purposes it has the right to claim.

"As individual members of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and of its Internal Security Subcommittee, we propose to collaborate in the preparation and introduction of legislation to provide severe punishment for any person or group invading the privacy of the jury room for the purpose of eavesdropping upon, or recording, a jury's deliberations.

"We believe the Internal Security Subcommittee, being a part of the Senate, could not properly inquire into the official conduct of any Federal Judge. We shall recommend that the transcripts of our hearings, yesterday and today, be transmitted to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives for its information."

That is the statement by Senators Eastland of Mississippi and Jenner of Indiana, constituting a majority of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, which for two days has been hearing testimony on the jury bugging incident in the Federal Court in Wichita, Kansas. The investigation, it was explained, is not closed, but there will be no further hearings tomorrow, to give counsel and staff an opportunity to prepare for what comes next.

Supposedly, the "next" is to dig into the Ford Foundation angle, and the incredible fact that after knowing what this project was doing -- that the money was going for tape recorder tapping of jury proceedings -- they boosted the original 400 thousand dollar grant by another one million dollars.

Two members of the House Judiciary Committee to which this record was referred late this afternoon already have stated their intention of demanding a study of impeachment possibilities -- Rep. Kenneth Keating of New York and Rep. Pat Hillings of California.

The Institute of Pacific Relations, stamping ground of the pro-Chinese communists, notably Owen Lattimore, and subject of bitter investigation and condemnation by a Senate Investigating Committee, has been stripped of its tax-exempt privileges by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the ruling is what the Bureau calls "for cause". And I learned from completely reliable sources that the Fund for the Republic is under intensive investigation, along the same lines.

October 14, 1955

UNANIMOUS CONDEMNATION

There are further interesting developments in connection with the Fund for the Republic and the Ford Foundation, from which it's 15 million dollar endowment came.

Editorial opinion from the newspapers over the nation was almost unanimous in condemning the jury tapping at Wichita, Kansas, by the University of Chicago Law School team, under the direction of Dean Edward H. Levi, and with the permission of the Federal Judge of that Court, Delmas P. Hill. I say almost unanimous, because thus far I have been unable to find ANY newspaper with the exception of the DES MOINES REGISTER AND TRIBUNE, which has approved of the project or even defended it. There could be a reason for that.

It so happens that the annual report of the Ford Foundation shows that on the Board of Directors of the Foundation there is the following listing: "John Cowles, President, MINNEAPOLIS STAR and TRIBUNE Company, Minneapolis, Minnesota." And one of the owners of the DES MOINES REGISTER and TRIBUNE.

Following the referral of the Senate Investigating Committee record of the jury-bugging scandal to the House Judiciary Committee for possible impeachment proceedings against the judge or judges in question, the Chairman of that Committee, Emanuel P. Celler of New York, said that he will give the matter his immediate personal consideration and that he will not hesitate to institute impeachment proceedings, if the facts seem to justify them.

It seems to be generally agreed in legal circles that in the case of a judge involved in an incident of this kind, it would not be necessary to demonstrate that he has actually violated any law, but merely that he has conducted his court in a manner not in keeping with accepted procedures and precedents. The impeachment, you understand, is merely the bringing of formal charges, which is done by the House of Representatives. It is like an indictment by a grand jury. If the subject is impeached by the House, he then is turned over to the Senate for trial, and they decide whether or not he is guilty as charged.

Now, while we're on this subject, I might call your attention to the fact that it was insisted, time and again, during the testimony of the University of Chicago people involved in this matter, that the only time the tape recordings were played back was on the occasion in Estes Park, Colorado in May of this year, when they were played for about 100 people, including 20 judges.

I have here a pamphlet that was put out by the University of Chicago, in August of 1954, a year ago, when the American Bar Association was holding its annual convention there, and this pamphlet is a listing of the various items of interest which the University of Chicago Law School had to offer for the visiting lawyers.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

I find that on page 8, under the listing "exhibits", title five, the following: Research projects at the University of Chicago Law School; Selection of exhibits and partial illustration of some research projects in progress at the University, including a study of the jury system.

The individual who provided me with this -- a man of unquestionable integrity -- informs me that he and several of his friends went to this project, and that two apparent University students had a tape play-back machine there, and were playing for visitors, tapes in connection with the jury study.

So it might be well for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to find out what those tapes were. it may well be that the Estes Park occasion was NOT the only one.

It might be very well and very appropriate also, for the Committee to invite the officials of the Ford Foundation to appear at these hearings and explain just what prompts them to make this sort of grant -- and the sort of other grants that have been made. They ought to want to explain, and certainly the public is entitled to have them explain, if there is any explanation. Because, as I've said before, these millions from the Ford Estate -- and they're swelling all the time from the dividends that are pouring in from the Ford Motor Company, out of its profits -- is supposed to be dedicated to the public interest, not to the public destruction. and damage to the jury system, is certainly to the public destruction.

Now, in the meantime, in New York it develops that three weeks after a man by the name of Amos Landman had pleaded the fifth amendment on about 20 occasions before a Senate investigating committee, he was hired by the Fund for the Republic on its administrative staff, and the arrogant and defiant young vice president and New York director for the Republic, Mr. W. H. "Ping" Ferry, told reporters that "of course they knew the record of Landman when they hired him", but that it did not appear to the directors of the Fund for the Republic that this was sufficient reason to bar him from temporary employment. He is on a per diem basis."

Landman was one of those named by Winston Burdette of the Columbia Broadcasting system, and before the Senate investigating committee an affidavit was produced, purportedly made by Landman to the U.S. Consular Office in Bombay India, stating that he previously belonged to the communist party, at the time Burdette was a member.

Landman refused to identify his signature, but the FBI and other experts testified that it was unquestionably his handwriting.

In the meantime also, there are further developments. On August 25 I first mentioned to you a 200 thousand dollar project, of the Fund for the Republic, to finance a series of weekly television programs by the cartoonist for the

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

extreme liberal WASHINGTON POST, "Herblock". On Friday, September 16th, I went into considerable detail about that individual, to the extent of giving a series of descriptions of the cartoons he has done over the past seven or eight years, to show the general editorial climate of his mind.

Last night, the Fund for the Republic announced that the project had been canceled, by mutual consent, because "Herblock's initial scripts showed his effectiveness as a news commentator would depend in large part on his complete freedom to discuss current issues and particular legislation. It became apparent that it would not be practical to limit Mr. Herblock's field of discussion to the boundaries set in the charter of the Fund."

So here is ONE that is stopped, dead in its tracks. There still, however, is a long way to go.

The truth is, the Bureau of Internal Revenue has been investigating the Herblock project, and the Fund for the Republic got scared and ran."

October 17, 1955

THE CIO CHAMPIONS THE FUND

The Fund for the Republic, which is increasingly under fire from all directions, found at least one champion today, in the C. I. O.

The weekly C. I. O. NEWS, which is the official publication of the organization publishes an editorial in its current issue, saying that it is becoming the fashion in some extreme right wing circles to run a continuous campaign of criticism against the Fund. It explains that the Fund for the Republic operates on a 15 million dollar grant from the Ford Foundation, and that it has turned its attention to the civil liberties problems that have engrossed the attention of many Americans in recent years. It quotes Robert Maynard Hutchins, the head of the Fund as saying that "the major factor affecting civil liberties today is the menace of communism and communist influences in this country." The editorial continues:

"But the Fund became fair game for the reactionaries when it followed through on another statement: 'coupled with this threat is the grave danger to civil liberties, in methods that may be used to combat the threat'. In other words, obviously, McCarthyism and other forms of hysteria.

"So, the distinguished Americans who comprise the Board of the Fund (most of them corporation presidents and corporation lawyers) are under attack from Senator Bricker, the Ohio Republican; Seaborn Collins, the National Commander of the American Legion; and an obscure radio spieler named Fulton Lewis.

"They're making a lot of noise, but it should distract nobody from the good work that the Fund for the Republic has been doing to strengthen our traditional

liberties."

There is another source, also, from which the Fund is deriving support and commendation -- the DAILY WORKER, official organ of the communist party. And you might keep in mind the fact that W. H. "Ping" Ferry, vice president of the Fund for the Republic and director of its activities from New York headquarters got his left wing political schooling in his role as public relations director of the C.I.O. Political Action Committee, in the days when Sidney Hillman, Lee Pressman, John Abt and Bill Remington were running it. It's understandable why the CIO would approve of what "Ping" Ferry is doing with his present 15 million dollars.

October 18, 1955

A SUGGESTION FOR THE
FORD FOUNDATION

President Eisenhower assured the governors of the flood stricken New York and New England areas that everything possible will be done to help restore the damage.

The tragedy about these flood sufferers is, however, that to all practical purposes, the government assistance has to be confined to loans -- money that the individuals have to repay -- and so there is no relief at all, for the loss that has been suffered, for example, on the part of those individuals whose homes have been destroyed. Just remember, insurance on private homes does not cover this sort of damage, and insofar as I've been able to determine, it is not even possible to get such insurance if you wished to get it.

The Jones family, for example, had its home and all of its belongings swept away in raging flood waters; it has no insurance to cover that loss because it was impossible to get such coverage; the government, perhaps, will lend money to restore the home, but there is no restoration of the loss. And there are very few families that can afford to suffer such a loss.

Which brings to mind a thought.

Here is the Ford Foundation with 500 million dollars -- about two billion dollars, really, because on the basis of the present dividends, the stock is worth about four times what it is listed for in the financial report of the Foundation.

The Ford Foundation has seen fit to give -- out of that 2 billion -- untold millions of dollars for all sorts and conditions of visionary and will-o-the-wisp projects in India, Indonesia, Pakistan, Turkey, Egypt -- countries scattered far and wide over the face of the earth. The government of Syria, \$25,000. Government of Pakistan, a million and a half. Government of Indonesia, for a

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

teacher's training program, \$110,000.

Let's get a little closer to home, though. The Foundation has given one million 400 thousand dollars to the University of Chicago for a program of jury tapping with tape recorders, and they gave one full million of it as additional financing on top of the first 400 thousand, with the express knowledge that it was to go for jury tapping.

That being the case -- why wouldn't it be much more in keeping with the memory of Henry and Edsel Ford if the Ford Foundation were now to come to the relief of these people in Connecticut and New York State -- and also in the Carolinas, where the damage from Diane was just as great as it now is in New York and New England -- and help them out of economic tragedies that were no fault of their own, and could leave these people with blighted and debt ridden futures for the rest of their lives.

After all, the Ford Estate, from which this Ford Foundation money comes, was made from profits which were contributed, at least in part, by these people of the presently stricken areas. It's almost certain that parts of the automobiles produced by the Ford Motor Company over the years, came from the hands and machines of these victims. And if the Ford Foundation can give 15 million dollars to the Fund for the Republic, to conduct the sort of activities which it has been and is conducting, then it certainly would not seem to be unreasonable to expect them to contribute toward this kind of relief -- especially inasmuch as there is no other apparent source of relief.

We contribute 15 million dollars to Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins and Mr. W. H. "Ping" Ferry to be spent in what they are pleased to call safeguarding the civil rights of these people. This is very important. But why isn't it even more important to do a little something toward safeguarding their right to live?

And that's no mere rhetorical question. That's a real question, and it should get a real answer.

The United Press carries an item under a Westfield, New Jersey dateline stating that Mark E. Richardson is reported to be under consideration for the job of Commissioner of Internal Revenue -- succeeding T. Coleman Andrews of Richmond, Virginia, whose resignation was announced by the Denver White House staff last Saturday.

It describes Mr. Richardson as being, currently, a partner in the New York accounting firm of Lybrand, Ross Brothers and Montgomery, and says he is a tax expert, and a member of a special commission which studied the Internal Revenue Service at the request of Congress, and submitted subsequently, a report that was very critical.

It happens, however, that there are other connections which Mr. Richardson

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

and his firm have, that are quite interesting.

The Fund for the Republic -- as I have reported to you previously -- is presently under examination by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and undoubtedly is going to be under further examination by Congress, with respect to its tax-exempt status, and whether its activities fall legitimately within the limits of permissible tax exempt activity.

In other words, there is a very burning question up before the Bureau of Internal Revenue as to whether the tax exempt status of the Fund for the Republic should not be revoked on the grounds that it is actually a political propaganda organization. In that event, a huge slice of the 15 million dollars which the Fund for the Republic received from the Ford Foundation would be picked up by Uncle Sam in taxes. So the question is very material as well as being just a matter of moral consideration and compliance.

I have before me -- and you may have before you, if you wrote and got your free copy of it, which I hope you did because it helps out on occasions of this kind -- the annual report of the Fund for the Republic.....page thirty-one, headed "Financial statements".....auditors report.

"To the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic.

"We have examined the statement of assets, liabilities, and Fund balance of the Fund for the Republic incorporated, as of September 30, 1954, and the related statement of receipts, grants and expenses for the period from December 9, 1952, the date of inception of the Corporation to September 30, 1954. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

"In our opinion, the accompanying statements present fairly the financial position of the Fund for the Republic incorporated at September 30, 1954, and its receipts, grants and expenses for the period from December 9, 1952 to September 30, 1954.

Signed -- guess who! -- Lybrand, Ross Brothers and Montgomery.

In short, this is the firm in which Mr. Mark E. Richardson, reported to be under consideration as the new Commissioner of Internal Revenue, is a partner.

Interesting?

October 19, 1955

MR. EARL BROWDER ON ASSIGNMENT
WITH A FUND PROJECT

The Scripps-Howard newspapers today carry a lead story by staff writer Jack Steele stating what I reported to you over this microphone on September 15th that Earl Browder, long time head of the communist party in the United States, and still a confirmed communist in ideology although he has been formally expelled from the party in a factional fight, is on the payroll of the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic, working on a project listed in the annual report on page 17 as a "Study of communist influence in American Life."

This, let me interject, is an excellent example of the way Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins and his assistant, W. H. "Ping" Ferry, operate in their expenditure of their 15 million dollars of tax free money; and it illustrates the general overall pattern of what they actually are doing.

This is a very meritorious project from the American point of view -- this study of communist influence in American life. This in effect is what the House UnAmerican Activities Committee is doing, and what several Senate Committees are doing. And if it is factual and objective and if it really wants to dig out the truth on all sides, that's fine.

But when you begin to read the fine print, and inquire into the little matter of who is going to work on this project, the light begins to dawn that it is far from objective. The director of the project, it develops, is none other than Professor Clinton Rossiter, extreme liberal professor at Cornell University, and the director of the sub-project labeled "History of the Communist Party in the United States, 1919 to 1945," is one Theodore Draper of New York City.

To you who see his name listed in this annual report, this means nothing at all. It might be anybody; and I suspect that among many members of the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic -- people of standing who should know better -- it means nothing, either. The fact is, Theodore Draper began his career some years ago as a reporter on the DAILY WORKER, and from there after years of service, was graduated to the more erudite New Masses.

And he's the bloke whom the Fund for the Republic has hired to cook up for the American people what will purport to be a fair, unprejudiced, unbiased treatise -- a text book, a bible, if you will -- on the history of the communist party in the United States.

And on his payroll is none other than Earl Browder himself, long recognized as communism's number one leader in the American conspiracy.

Now, when I first broke this story, the Fund for the Republic issued an

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

official statement in the name of Professor Rossiter, stating that "Mr. Browder is not an employee, a consultant, a staff member, a researcher or a project member or any other kind of employee or associate of the project or the Fund for the Republic."

Now that is rather flat, after all, and it doesn't beat around the bush.

The truth is that Browder not only has been and is employed by the Fund, but he is on the record as such, having been called before a closed session of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and questioned about his duties for the Fund.

And the Scripps Howard story today states that Dr. Rossiter, apparently more straightforward than Mr. 'Ping' Ferry's New York Office of the Fund, told reporter Jack Steele, quite frankly, that Earl Browder IS working for his project, and is being paid fairly well, although he would not say how much. When asked if Browder could be classified as a paid informer, Dr. Rossiter objected and said he considers it more accurate to call him a paid commentator. This I resent.

The reason for the distinction, of course, is that the Fund for the Republic also is conducting a purported study of professional anti-communist witnesses and paid informers.

So that is what finally boils out of the fancy sounding project, "Study of communist influence in American life". . . . Professor Rossiter, Theodore Draper, and Earl Browder.

And for this, the Fund for the Republic has appropriated 550 thousand dollars.

Henry Ford the Second now has undertaken to answer protests to him about the Fund for the Republic in individual personal letters, signed by him personally. They say that the Ford Foundation has no control over the activities of the Fund for the Republic, but merely granted the 15 million dollars for its activities, with no strings attached. He refers the writers of the protest letters to the Fund for the Republic and suggests that they make their complaints direct.

That, of course, hardly answers the question.

The question is: why did the Foundation make this grant to such people in the beginning.

October 20, 1955

HENRY FORD WRITES A LETTER

Donald K. David, former Dean of the Graduate School of Business Administration at Harvard University, and director of numerous top industrial corporations, including the Ford Motor Company, was announced last night as the new chairman of the executive committee of the Ford Foundation, beginning November 1st, and my understanding is that he will take over the job on a full time basis as the acting operating head of the Ford Foundation.

He has been on the board of trustees of the Foundation ever since 1948, when it was set up in its present form, and is one of three representatives of the Ford Motor Company on the board of trustees. The other two are Henry Ford the second, and Benson Ford, his younger brother. There are twelve trustees in all.

In the meantime, more copies of personally signed letters from Henry Ford the Second are pouring in, in the mail, and while they are definitely not form letters, they all take the same general line -- that the Ford Foundation has no responsibility for the actions or projects or policies of the Fund for the Republic, and has no control over what it does or how it spends its money.

They all end with the same paragraph:

"I suggest, therefore, if you have any questions about specific actions of the Fund for the Republic, that you write directly to the Fund. Its offices are at 60 East 42nd Street, New York 17, New York."

Then, in long hand below, the following:

"Very Sincerely, Henry Ford Second."

Now, I have spent a great deal of time and money, ladies and gentlemen, over the past few weeks, digging into the tax aspects of this Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic, and the connection between them, and I have contacted and gotten the considered opinions of many of the very top experts in the field of taxation, in and out of government. And as a result, I have come up with certain basic points on which there seems to be unanimous agreement, and they do not entirely agree with Mr. Henry Ford's statements.

Number one, the Fund for the Republic, at the present time, enjoys so-called tax-exempt status, which means that it does not have to pay any tax on any income that it may receive. That is largely academic, because the Fund for the Republic avowedly intends to spend its fifteen million dollars in capital, which it received from the Ford Foundation, and then, unless more is forthcoming, go out of business.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

But the Ford Foundation is a different matter. If it spends the money it has in ways other than are permitted by law -- other than the objectives for which it was set up -- it also is subject to losing its tax-exempt status, but in the case of the Foundation, its running income is very important indeed, because it owns 89-1/2 percent of the stock of the Ford Motor Company, and the annual dividends from that stock are estimated at somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 million dollars.that's every year. And if it does not spend it in accordance with the law, that 80 million dollars a year is taxable by the Federal Treasury.

Now, here's the important point. It may be that the Ford Foundation has no operating or policy control over the Fund for the Republic. That may be as they say. But if its so, it was a very foolish way for the Fund to be set up, because, it develops, the Ford Foundation still is responsible, tax-wise, for the proper spending of the Fund for the Republic money. And if the Fund for the Republic is not spending its money in keeping with the rules, then the Ford Foundation is responsible, in the eyes of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, and the Ford Foundation is subject to having its tax exemption terminated -- even on a retroactive basis.

This is one to think about.

There are reports that several members of the Fund for the Republic board of directors either have resigned or are planning to do so, in the near futurealso reports that the Ford Foundation leaders are highly concerned about the jury bugging disclosures and the activities of Robert Maynard Hutchins and his Fund for the Republic crusaders.

Well, they might be, because if you could see the mountain of material on both outfits that is pouring into me, your eyes would pop out of your head -- leads, clues -- enough to last months.

October 21, 1955

SENATOR BRICKER BLOCKS A FUND PROPOSAL

Senator John Bricker of Ohio told me today that he blocked a proposal in the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee by which the Fund for the Republic, with its 15 million dollars worth of Ford Foundation money was to be given the job of directing and conducting a Congressional inquiry.

It had been proposed to the Chairman of the Subcommittee which was to conduct an investigation of the radio and television industries, that the work of gathering the material and processing it -- the general staff work of the investigation -- be turned over to the Fund for the Republic, and the Chairman, Senator Warren Magnuson, Democrat of Washington, had stated publicly that he thought it was an excellent idea, would save the Committee money, and that

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

this was the sort of a job the Fund for the Republic could handle very well.

(In the light of what has been disclosed since then, you probably have a pretty good idea how the project would have been handled. . . . they might have hired not only Earl Browder but William Z. Foster as well, on this one. . . . but the frightening thing is to see how close they came to getting the opportunity. They had the Committee Chairman sold on the idea, and it was only when Senator Bricker contacted the Chairman, personally, told him what the Fund for the Republic is. . . . that it is completely slanted, and nothing more than a left wing propaganda operation. . . . it was not until Senator Bricker said he would take the fight to the floor of the Senate if necessary, that the idea was dropped.

And here would have been the ideal vantage point from which to operate, so far as the Fund for the Republic is concerned. Ordinarily, they have to confine their efforts to attempting to influence Congress and public opinion indirectly -- through their broad, general propaganda activities and projects. This way they would have actually moved in and taken over the operating machinery of a Congressional investigation and one that could have staggering effect on the entire radio and television structure of the nation.

As it is, they have set up two investigations into radio and television -- one for 25 thousand dollars and one for 100 thousand. Had this little deal gone through, they would have been able to conduct those alleged studies under the cloak of a Congressional committee, with the power of subpoena and the full force of Congressional authority behind them. This is bold business indeed. Audacious.

October 24, 1955

JURY BUGGING TO BE PROHIBITED; FUND SEEKS AN AMENABLE CATHOLIC SCHOOL

In Denver, President Eisenhower was allowed to stand on two occasions for several minutes today, and visitors who saw him said that he looks exceptionally well, and seems to be in excellent spirits.

The visitors were the American Ambassador to the United Nations, former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts, and two members of his economic advisory council -- Dr. Arthur F. Burns and Dr. Gabriel Hague. They presented him with a plan for government assistance to areas that are suffering from chronic unemployment, and they said the President gave it his enthusiastic approval.

Henry Cabot Lodge said he discussed various United Nations problems with the President, including the deadlock over the remaining seat in the Security Council, which the United States wants to go to the Philippines and which Yugoslavia is fighting for bitterly.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

The Denver White House schedule of conferences with top cabinet heads began last week with Mr. Dulles, prior to his departure for Geneva, and on Friday, of course, Attorney General Brownell presented a general program for the Department of Justice, which included immediate legislation in the new session of Congress, to put an end to the jury tapping operation which was financed by the Ford Foundation to the tune of one million 400 thousand dollars.

You know that jury tapping deal is more significant than appears on the surface because the jury is one of the most important symbols of the difference between our system of justice and that of communism and other dictatorships.

Dictatorships do not have juries, for good reason: it is impossible for the political leaders to control them. They administer justice through judges who can be controlled, and if they don't obey the controls they can be replaced. And it would be very simple indeed, in the course of a study like the one the Ford Foundation has been financing through the University of Chicago, to come up with a finding that the jury system is unsatisfactory because jurors don't understand the cases, and they do not approach the subject correctly, and they are over-impressed with personalities of the principles involved, or the behavior of the judge, or whether or not the prosecuting attorney is personable or not.

And don't come back with the suggestion that the project would not have been placed in the hands of anyone who had preconceived ideas. Don't swallow that for a moment. The fact is, that is exactly the pattern that has been followed in these Ford Foundation and Fund for the Republic projects in repeated cases. In fact, in some of the grants in aid by the Fund for the Republic, for the writing of books and papers, etc., representatives of the Fund for the Republic have prescribed material that is to go into the book, and have read them in advance and made detailed proposals for changes here and additions there -- to strengthen this point or that one.

And the intent of the jury study by the University of Chicago is demonstrated rather plainly by the testimony which the head of the project, Dean Edward H. Levi, made before the Eastland Committee, when he attempted to defend the practice, and argued that it was quite all right. President Eisenhower didn't think it was all right, and he personally -- after these disclosures -- instructed that the Department of Justice ask for legislation to stop the practice immediately.

Incidentally, there is a reliable report that the Fund for the Republic is trying to get Catholic University here in Washington to accept a grant of 50 thousand dollars to make a study of Justice in the military courts, but the Dean of the Law School told me this afternoon that he has received no official approach on the subject, and doesn't understand where the reports are coming from. Georgetown University -- also a Catholic institution and a very fine one -- got such an offer on another project, involving communism, several months ago, and would have no part of it.

October 25, 1955

MR. HUTCHINS WRITES A LETTER

Now, I have here tonight a very astounding letter from a listener to this program, dated yesterday, which begins:

"Knowing your interest in anything pertaining to the Fund for the Republic, I felt that the enclosed letter might be better in your files than in mine.

"I must explain my side of the story though. I received one of those seemingly personal letters from Henry Ford the Second (in answer to a protest letter of mine) in which he asks if we have suggestions, to forward them to the Fund for the Republic, and gave us their address. (Let me interject that I reported to you several times on this form letter which is being sent out over the signature of Henry Ford the Second.)

"It so happened that I received my this month's issue of the Readers Digest in the same mail -- and having read the continued articles by Richard and Gladys Harkness, "How about those security cases", I felt here was a good suggestion for this organization. Hence, I got off a postcard with the following written on it: 'Having received a letter from Henry Ford, Second, today, which asked that I pass any suggestions I might have on to you, at the Fund for the Republic, I urge that if you want to investigate our security program, you hire some people of sound principles, such as Richard and Gladys Harkness, instead of the left wing group to which you entrust such work.'

"Today, I am in receipt of this enclosed letter from the Fund for the Republic, sent air mail, and postmarked Pasadena, California. At first I thought it was a personal letter too, but note that the signature is not hand written but a stamp of some sort -- or so it looks to me.

"It all leads me to believe that others have received this same note, and maybe you should warn them not to be too alarmed about it. I certainly said nothing for which I could be sued for libel and I intend to write and tell them so."

Now, the letter which the writer enclosed to me, on the stationery of the Fund for the Republic, Pasadena Office, date October 21, 1955.

"Dear Mrs. Blank (the identity is not important):

"As a lawyer, I must warn you that your postcard, received here today, is libelous, and the gentlemen you have libeled cannot be expected to submit to continued accusations of this type. The members of the committee heading the program you speak of are:

"Chairman, Dudley B. Bonsal, Curtis, Mallet, Provost, Colt and Mosel,

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

New York, New York. "

And then it lists additionally, eight more lawyers who appear with Bonsal, on page 14 of the Fund for the Republic annual report, -- Richard Bentley of Chicago, Frederick M. Bradley of Washington, Henry J. Friendly of New York, Harold M. Kennedy of New York, Monte M. Lemann of New Orleans, John O'Melveny of Los Angeles, George Roberts of New York, and Whitney North Seymour of New York, plus the name of Elliot E. Cheatham, Professor of Law at Columbia University, as staff director. At the end is the signature Robert M. Hutchins, President.

This is a committee which ostensibly is to make a study of the loyalty-security program of the Federal Government -- to quote the report specifically, "to make a dispassionate appraisal of the program."

Now, I'm prepared to show you tomorrow night, that actually, a detailed outline of instructions as to how this so-called study was to be conducted was drawn up by the Fund for the Republic, and I'll tell you some things about the dispassionate attitude of the people who are working on it.

I'll also show you that this is only one very small part of the loyalty-security investigation project, which the writer referred to in her postcard..... a major portion of the propaganda operations of the Fund for the Republic are on that subject.

The interesting point for the moment is that Henry Ford the Second passes the buck to the Fund for the Republic -- the exact words of his letter are: "I suggest therefore, if you have any questions about direct actions of the Fund for the Republic, that you write directly to the Fund. It's offices are at 60 East Forty Second Street, New York 17, New York."

When the writer follows the suggestion and writes to the Fund, he gets back a letter from Robert Maynard Hutchins, in Pasadena, threatening him with a mass libel suit. And this is all your money, remember.

October 26, 1955

ARTHUR H. DEAN RESIGNS;
THE FUND'S PROJECT GUIDANCE

The New York Journal American and other Hearst newspapers over the country carried a page one story this afternoon -- two column top head -- under the joint by-line of Leon Racht and Jeffrey Roche, confirming the report which I passed along to you AS a report last week -- that Arthur H. Dean, a member of the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic, has resigned because he disapproves of the policies of the Fund.

The story says that Dean himself was reluctant to discuss his resignation,

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

and referred the reporters to Paul Hoffman, the Chairman of the Board of the Fund for the Republic, who, in turn, referred them back to Mr. Dean, after confirming the fact that the resignation has taken place. It says that Dean said he is sorry that he had to resign, because Paul Hoffman is a close personal friend of his and he doesn't want to do anything that would embarrass Hoffman. The story says that Hoffman, in his brief discussion of the matter, threw in the cryptic remark that "I can't believe that Mr. Dean doesn't believe in the Bill of Rights".

Actually, the remark is not so cryptic, but rather is just a reflection of the elusive jargon that all of the topside of the Fund for the Republic uses constantly. Their contention for public consumption is that the objective of the Fund for the Republic activities is a defense of the Bill of Rights, and civil liberties generally. The play is that if you disagree with anything the Fund for the Republic does, or any of the projects it undertakes, you are an enemy of the Bill of Rights, and an opponent of civil liberties. And in this case, Paul Hoffman used the pitch, even at a man who considers himself to be Hoffman's friend.

It is, of course, obvious from the circumstances that Arthur H. Dean allowed himself to be used to give dignity to the Fund for the Republic, as an accommodation to a personal friend, only to find that he couldn't, in good conscience go through with it. . . . and I have reason to believe that other members of the Board of Directors of the Fund are on there for the same reason. Several more of them are much disturbed about activities and general conduct and complexion of the Fund for the Republic, and there may be other resignations, following this one.

Getting back to last night's story, of the individual who wrote a note of suggestion to the Fund for the Republic, at the recommendation of Henry Ford the Second who said he had nothing to do with the activities of the Fund -- you recall that I reported to you that when she did write to the Fund at the New York office, she received immediately, by air mail from the Fund headquarters in Pasadena, California, a letter signed by Robert M. Hutchins, threatening her with a mass libel suit.

Her letter of suggestion had proposed that two experienced reporters should be substituted instead of "the left wing group" which the Fund has studying the loyalty-security program of the government, and Hutchins, in his reply, said that as a lawyer, he was warning her that her postcard is libelous, and the libeled individuals could not be expected to continue to submit to accusations of this kind.

Then he listed, as heading the program she had mentioned, a list of nine lawyers from various parts of the nation, listed in the annual report of the Fund for the Republic as constituting a committee to study the loyalty-security program of the federal government.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

The libel threat, of course, was ridiculous. But the technique of Mr. Robert Maynard Hutchins is well demonstrated by the fact that he seized upon this particular project regarding the loyalty security program, and ignored the many, many other projects of the Fund attacking the loyalty security program.

I might mention that even this one has its questionable characteristics, particularly when Mr. Hutchins, in his annual report, says that this committee is going to make a "dispassionate" appraisal of the loyalty-security program.

It so happens that there is a paid consultant on the staff of the Fund for the Republic, by the name of Walter Millis, a former assistant editorial writer for the New York Herald Tribune. His views and writings were so far on the extreme liberal side, that it was no surprise to the New York newspaper fraternity, when his column was dropped from the newspaper, and he later ceased writing for the Herald Tribune syndicate. It happened at about the time the new editorial management of the paper took over about a year and a half ago.

Mr. Millis, as consultant to the Fund, is associated with a particular project -- this particular project -- the lawyers' study of the Federal Loyalty-Security Program. I so wrote recently in my newspaper column, and he wrote letters to various papers carrying that column, which they duly printed, denying any connection with it. It so happens that I have a letter over his own signature, stating his connection with the project, so he'll have to disprove his own letter.

In any event, Mr. Millis participated recently in a radio program entitled "The Leading Question", over the Columbia Broadcasting System, in which he debated Judge Robert Morris, former chief counsel for the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and now a Municipal Judge in New York, and the debate was on the subject of the loyalty-security program. I don't have to read very much of it to you.....one sentence is enough. This is Mr. Millis, and I'm reading from the transcript:

"What I object to is not the procedure in the (loyalty-security) program, but the very fact that the system is there".

As late as September -- last month -- he wrote a newspaper article entitled "Are subversives really subversive", which was a tirade of attack against the loyalty-security program as a whole, and against the F. B. I. in particular, and he referred to the latter as a "secret political police". One paragraph of the article reads as follows:

"The truth seems to be that the great structure of internal security does not rest upon hard facts at all, but on a series of indefinable fears and unverifiable assumptions."

This is the character on the staff of the Fund for the Republic, whose

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

particular assignment is on this dispassionate appraisal of the Loyalty-Security program. And I am prepared to produce all of the documents involved here, to verify my reporting.

The interesting fact, however, is that the same paragraph of the Fund's annual report which lists the lawyers' project, for the investigation of the loyalty-security program, also tells of a 100 thousand dollar project by one Adam Yarmolinsky, doing a hand picked compilation of some 50 actual loyalty-security cases, designed to show how mistreated the individual subjects were, despite the fact that most of them were cleared of the security doubts about them; another project for the compilation of laws and regulations pertaining to loyalty-security matters; another of blacklisting, as they call it, in private industry, by the imposition of security provisions on employees engaged in government contracts; and elsewhere the report shows one project after another, on the subject of the loyalty-security question. It is, in fact, a major subject of Fund projects. There are repeated articles, pamphlets and books which the Fund has sent out to selected lists, on various phases of the subject.

And its very convenient to have 15 million dollars, for such distribution, and if you'll write something on the ultra liberal or anti-anti-communist side of the picture, you'll be able to get big distribution from the Fund for the Republic. Write against the security system, or congressional investigations into communism, or most anything along that line, and the Fund will buy tens of thousands of them, and distribute them at their expense.

I doubt, however, that they will make any grant for the distribution of this series of broadcasts which, as I've told you, we are having printed in book form, for those who want a documentary record of what has been revealed about the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic over this microphone.

But we, on the American side, have ways too, I'm happy to say.

Let me read you a letter which came in my mail this morning:

"In connection with the book which you are producing, with your broadcasts on the Fund for the Republic, I recall that in one of the broadcasts you disclosed that this fund was sending some of their malicious propaganda to a list of Federal Judges. Would you like to send your book to these same judges, if you know who they are. Or even if you do not know, perhaps you might want to send it to a list of judges. If so, I would like to consider financing this project, or, if it is too expensive, perhaps part of it.

"At any rate, if you are interested, please let me know what you think it will cost and I will give you a prompt answer."

Out of deference to the gentleman involved, I don't want to give his name, but its a New York City address.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

Of course, the Fund for the Republic has circularized the Federal Judges of the country on repeated occasions with their propaganda, including, if memory serves, the statement by Senator Hubert Humphrey on the loyalty-security question which he inserted in the Congressional Record as an extension of his remarks, and which the Fund sent to the Federal Judges all over the nation, labeled as an official report of a Senate Committee. And they have sent other documents to lists of teachers, ministers of the gospel, doctors, bar association memberships and so forth. But we don't have any 15 million dollars.

I called the writer of this letter this afternoon, however, and told him what the list of Federal Judges amounts to -- 317.....9 on the Supreme Court, 68 on the Courts of Appeal, and 240 on the Federal District benches. His reply was you'll have a check immediately.....send the volume to the entire list.

So, we have patriots on the American side, too.

October 27, 1955

ANOTHER DIRECTOR RESIGNS; MINNESOTA QUESTIONNAIRE

Another resignation today from the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic.....First it was Arthur H. Dean, former law partner of Secretary of State Dulles, who resigned because of disagreement with and disapproval of the policies of the Fund.....Today it is Harry S. Ashmore, executive editor of the Arkansas Gazette in Little Rock Arkansas, and the reason he gives is that he thinks it would be improper to retain his connection with the Fund as long as he is working for Adlai Stevenson, on Stevenson's preliminary political campaign.

Also, I might mention that my office in Washington received in today's mail a request for a copy of the volume of printed scripts of this series on the Ford Foundation and the Fund for the Republic, enclosing one dollar in payment, and the signature was -- guess what -- "The Fund for the Republic" -- signed by William M. Goldsmith, who does not appear in the annual report of the fund, but I suppose is somebody on the staff. That is one dollar I shall frame.

Now, tonight, the trail of the Ford Foundation leads to the University of Minnesota, and a project there which is rather incredible, and it requires a little advance qualification.

I stumbled across this one recently when I went to Minneapolis for a speaking engagement, and my original information came from Mr. Claude Efnor, who edits and publishes a newspaper called the Northwest Industrial News. It seems that he investigated it, and was informed by a member of the faculty that this was supported by funds from the Ford Foundation. He published an article on it, entitled "Who are the lunatics", and in the course of my own checking, I contacted the faculty member who is directly in charge of the project. He admitted that he has received some money from the Ford Foundation -- a very considerable quantity, in fact -- but contended that it is not being used for this

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

particular project. Since talking to him, I have made further inquiries, and I have now a letter from a member of the Board of Regents of the University, stating categorically and flatly that the project IS being financed by the Ford Foundation.

This is not another case of jury tapping -- this is sort of selective brain-washing, and that, in fact, is what Mr. Efnor called it in his article.

It seems that the University of Minnesota has what it calls a "Laboratory for Research in Social Relations". This particular project consists of a questionnaire, in the form of a pamphlet, 28 pages long, the first five pages of which contain questions about the individual being questioned, such as what age group he is in, sex, marital status, whether self-employed, and so forth. It asks the religious preference of the individual, and then:

"How often do you attend church? Very often, fairly often, not very often, never, and finally, don't know." You're supposed to check the one that fits your case. It goes on to ask in what country were you born, was it on a farm, in a small town, in a suburb, in a big city?

Then come nine questions on your views on public affairs; then some questions as to your views on national leaders, and the ones they list are Stevenson, Nixon, Truman, McCarthy, Warren, Jenner, Wallace, Kefauver, Eisenhower, and Knowland. In each case you are asked to check one of the following: Strongly favor; favor; oppose; strongly oppose; no opinion.

Which of these men would you like most to see become president in 1956. Which man do you think has done most for his country? When history books of the future are written, which man stands the best chance of being ranked with Lincoln and Washington in the service of their country.

There are other questions about this list as to whether you would actively work for your favorite if he were nominated by one of the major parties, then if he were nominated by a third party. Finally there is a category which asks your views on various current topics such as declaring the communist party to be illegal, tariff reduction, who should benefit by any income tax reductions, should the minimum wage law be increased to \$1.25 an hour, was the Supreme Court desegregation decision for the schools a good idea, military expenditures, co-existence with Soviet Russia, should Red China be given Quemoy and Matsu Islands.

Then, beginning page 7, comes the main body of the questionnaire, and with each of the 21 pages of questions there is a letter "A" and a letter "D", with the instruction: "If you agree with the statement, circle "A", if you disagree, circle "D".

Now, I'm going to select a sample page of these questions, and read them to

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

you, just as they come. . . . remember, 21 pages of this, and in the course of the 21 pages, each one is repeated as many as 6 or 8 times, in different wording, but with the same sense. Here they are:

"I get a big kick out of fairs, carnivals and circuses.

"There can never be real peace in the world as long as the profit system is still in control.

"Is it all right to get around the law if you don't actually break it?

"I don't really like the way some strangers will try to strike up a conversation with a person.

"Let's face it, the only way to bring peace and order back to the world is to make America the one powerful nation on earth.

"I seldom do things impulsively on the spur of the moment.

"On the whole our economic system is just and wise.

"As long as we have a system of private ownership, we will be in serious danger of losing our freedom.

"It's no use worrying my head about public affairs, I can't do anything about them anyhow.

"The person who says he wants to take it easy is usually just making up excuses.

"I prefer the practical man any time to the man of ideas.

"I think the government should give a person work if he can't find another job.

"I feel I am liked and accepted by most of my neighbors.

"I sometimes feel like a tiny cog in a huge machine.

"I like to read about politics.

"We need a strong central government to handle modern economic problems efficiently.

"In Congress the best view wins out in the long run.

"The best kind of politician is one who is just like the rest of us.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

"There are too many bureaucrats in government.

"I have sometimes worn a button supporting the candidate I intend to vote for.

"I believe in the second coming of Christ.

"Nowadays more and more people are prying into things that ought to remain personal and private.

"You can depend on it that business will charge all the public can stand."

Now, you make what you will of that; the interesting part of it is the information which I got from the rather churlish professor who is at the head of the project -- information which corroborated the information which Mr. Efnor reports he got from the gentleman, and information which another informant tells me she received when she called to make some inquiries after receiving one of the questionnaires. (A)

The explanation is that this is a project to study the thinking of the so-called conservative classes.....the list to which this questionnaire was sent was made up, the Professor admitted to me, from letters to the editor in newspapers when the sense of the letter reflected a conservative point of view; known members of fashionable clubs, residents of the more wealthy suburbs of the city, and so forth. I asked the Professor what the ultimate purpose of the survey was, and he told me as he told the others, that it would give his staff and the faculty an idea of the intellectual atmosphere in which students from those areas come, so that the teaching courses can be modeled to induce "better thinking".

There was something of a high pressure system about getting these questionnaires filled out; they were sent out first by mail, then if they were not returned, a representative of the project called on the subject for a personal interview, and urged them, as a service to the community, to fill it out and turn it in.

Incidentally, at the end of the questionnaire is a place for the name of the individual, but a notation that it is not necessary to sign it.

October 28, 1955

CRITICISM OF FUND'S BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Fund for the Republic story takes a new and surprising turn in the happenings of the day, today, largely centering around one of the pet projects of Dr. Robert Maynard Hutchins and his high pressure kid vice president, W. H. Ping Ferry -- a study of the Communist Record, which you will find listed in your copy of the annual report of the Fund for the Republic on page 38. As

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

chairman, it lists Arthur E. Sutherland, Professor of Law at Harvard University; among the three members of the committee is listed Clinton Rossiter, Professor of Government at Cornell University, who is director of the larger, overall "Study of communist influence in American life." The appropriation for the former project, which is titled "A study of the communist record, including bibliography, digest and microfilms", is 64 thousand 500 dollars. The other larger project, which we can forget for tonight, except for the angle that Rossiter is involved in both, has an appropriation of \$300,000.

Professor Sutherland's group, with a Stanford University Law Professor as staff director, went to work on the bibliography of communism back in 1953, and the annual report of the Fund for the Republic has this to say about it, over Dr. Robert M. Hutchins' signature:

"Since most of the pressure on civil liberties has resulted from fear of the communists in America, the Fund financed a study of the official records, bearing on communist activity by a committee under the chairmanship of Professor Arthur E. Sutherland of the Harvard Law School. The committee is listed in the appendix. Mr. Sutherland's group has prepared a digest of the principal judicial and administrative hearings, in which the communist party has been involved, together with a FULL bibliography. These volumes have been distributed to University, research and public libraries. Microfilm records of the leading court cases on communist activities have been placed in a few large libraries, throughout the country."

In short, this is a library stuffing project, to place in strategic points, where the student and scholar will go to seek source material, a purported authentic and complete bibliography of all writings and books on the subject of communism. The publication of the 475 page volume is now complete, and the books are on the shelves of some 12 hundred libraries over the nation, as bibles of reference material on the subject of communism.

Mr. Frederick Woltman, staff writer for the Scripps Howard newspapers, in his column today, said that outstanding scientists who have studied the volume say that the work was so ineptly done as to omit a vast collection and assortment of some of the most effective and illuminating books in existence on the "ANTI communist side." He quoted Professor Phillip Taft, of the Economic Department at Brown University, a leading authority on labor history and communism in trade unions, as having told Professor Sutherland: "You deserve a vote of thanks from the communist party!" From the standpoint of non-communists, the volume is an outrageous performance.

And even while this was appearing in print, the magazine New Leader carried a sizzling article by John A. Sessions, who himself is engaged in a project under the larger communist study by Professor Rossiter. The New Leader is an anti-communist, otherwise very liberal weekly, generally directing its interests to the labor field.

The Fulton Lewis Jr. Report on The Fund For The Republic

The Sessions article begins:

"It would be difficult to imagine a work of scholarship, at once more important and more badly done, than the bibliography on the communist problem in the United States, financed and published by the Fund for the Republic. . . . It is unquestionably the most ambitious and best financed attempt to provide a definitive work in this field. And yet, the compilers of this volume have consistently omitted the most important works of many of the very writers who have done most to illuminate the problem."

The article then goes on to list, chapter and verse, some of the references that have been omitted, including works of Angelica Balabanoff, first secretary of the Communist Internationale, whose autobiography Mr. Sessions describes as one of the most illuminating accounts we have of the internal operation of the Comintern. Nothing at all from her, and nothing from Dwight MacDonald, "whose attacks on the communists have become an integral part of our intellectual history." Arthur Koestler, who wrote "Darkness at Noon" and other vital exposes of the communist conspiracy, is given one brief article which he wrote for the New York Times. And so Mr. Sessions continues, pointing out the strange succession of omissions, in a document that is supposed to tell the whole story. Finally, he ends with the following:

"One can only wonder what has happened. There are two possible explanations. One is that this book results from incompetence, that the compilers honestly did not know where to look for the materials they were supposedly seeking. If so, it is slight excuse: this is too important a matter to be left to rank amateurs."

"The second possibility is the more disturbing one: that somehow, the anti-anti-communist attitude has touched this work. Professor Arthur Sutherland of the Harvard University Law School, who was in charge of this project, is a legal scholar of unquestioned repute. But as is the fashion in scholarship these days, he turned the actual work over to a corps of assistants. It would be interesting to know more about these assistants, and to know what Professor Sutherland did to check on their political background, before he turned the work over to them. If the Fund for the Republic seriously wishes to defend itself against such attacks as have been leveled against it by Fulton Lewis and the American Legion, it must do something to make amends for this bibliography. The job has been so badly done that nothing remains but to do it over again."

In answer to the inquiry about who assisted Professor Sutherland on this project, the annual report shows, in addition to Professor Rossiter, the Rev. Joseph M. Snee, Society of Jesus, Georgetown University, and Charles Fairman, Nagel Professor of Constitutional Law and Political Science, Washington University in St. Louis.

DIRECTORS OF THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

Chairman

PAUL G. HOFFMAN
Chairman of the Board
Studebaker-Packard Corporation
Los Angeles, California

Vice-Chairman

GEORGE N. SHUSTER
President
Hunter College
New York, New York

HARRY S. ASHMORE
Executive Editor
Arkansas Gazette
Little Rock, Arkansas

CHESTER BOWLES
Essex, Connecticut

CHARLES W. COLE
President
Amherst College
Amherst, Massachusetts

ARTHUR H. DEAN
Attorney
Sullivan & Cromwell
New York, New York

RUSSELL L. DEARMONT
Attorney
St. Louis, Missouri

RICHARD J. FINNEGAN*
Consulting Editor
Chicago Sun-Times
Chicago, Illinois

ERWIN N. GRISWOLD
Dean, Law School of
Howard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS
President
The Fund for the Republic, Inc.

WILLIAM H. JOYCE, JR.
Chairman of the Board
Joyce Inc.
Pasadena, California

MEYER KESTNBAUM
President
Hart Schaffner & Marx
Chicago, Illinois

M. ALBERT LINTON
Chairman of the Board
Provident Mutual Life
Insurance Company
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

JOHN LORD O'BRIAN
Attorney
Covington & Burling
Washington, D. C.

*Died May 6, 1955

DIRECTORS OF THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

JUBAL R. PARTEN

President

Woodley Petroleum Company

Houston, Texas

ELMO ROPER

Elmo Roper & Associates

New York, New York

ROBERT E. SHERWOOD

The Playwrights' Company

New York, New York

MRS. ELEANOR B. STEVENSON

Oberlin, Ohio

JAMES D. ZELLERBACH

President

Crown Zellerbach Corporation

San Francisco, California

OFFICERS AND STAFF OF THE FUND FOR THE REPUBLIC

President

ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

Vice-President

W. H. FERRY

Secretary and Treasurer

DAVID F. FREEMAN

Assistant to the President

HALLOCK HOFFMAN

EDWARD REED

JOSEPH P. LYFORD

Assistant Treasurer

THOMAS J. GARDNER

Assistant Secretary

WINIFRED G. MESKUS

Counsel

BETHUEL M. WEBSTER

THE OFFICERS OF THE FORD FOUNDATION

President

H. ROWAN GAITHER, JR.

Vice President

DYKE BROWN

Vice President

THOMAS H. CARROLL

Vice President

WILLIAM MCPEAK

Vice President

DON K. PRICE

Secretary

JOSEPH M. MCDANIEL, JR.

Treasurer

OLIVER MAY

Assistant to the President

WALDEMAR A. NIELSEN

THE TRUSTEES OF THE FORD FOUNDATION

Chairman

HENRY FORD II
President
Ford Motor Company
Detroit, Michigan

Members of the Board

FRANK W. ABRAMS
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York

JAMES F. BROWNLEE
Partner
J. H. Whitney and Company
New York, New York

JOHN COWLES
President
Minneapolis Star and
Tribune Company
Minneapolis, Minnesota

DONALD K. DAVID
Dean
Harvard Graduate School of
Business Administration
Boston, Massachusetts

MARK F. ETHRIDGE
Publisher
The Courier-Journal
Louisville, Kentucky

BENSON FORD
Vice-President
Ford Motor Company
Detroit, Michigan

H. ROWAN GAITHER, JR.
President
The Ford Foundation
New York, New York

LAURENCE M. GOULD
President
Carleton College
Northfield, Minnesota

JOHN J. MCCLOY
Chairman of the Board
Chase National Bank
New York, New York

CHARLES E. WILSON
Chairman, Executive Committee
W. R. Grace and Company
New York, New York

CHARLES E. WYZANSKI, JR.
Judge
United States District Court
Boston, Massachusetts

INDEX

A

Abt, John, 44, 51, 56, 58, 89
 Academic freedom, 21, 42, 66, 67
 Air raids, 65
 Aldrich, Winthrop, 24
 Aliens, 21, 31
 Alsop, Stewart & Joseph, 72
 American Bar Association
 Convention (Chicago), 86
 American Bar Foundation, 20
 American Civil Liberties Union,
 55, 71
 American College of Hospital
 Administrators, 58
 American Dental Association, 9
 American Friends Service Com-
 mittee, 20, 38, 62-66;
 see also Quakers, Plymouth
 Meeting, (Society of Friends)
 American Heritage Council, 20,
 22-27, 29, 31, 73
 American Jewish League Against
 Communism, 76
 American Legion, 1, 11, 20, 22-
 29, 31, 40-42, 47, 50, 53, 73,
 75, 88, 108
 American Legion Convention
 (Miami) 28, 76, 82
 American Library Association, 21
 American University, 42
 American Veterans Committee, 74
 Americans For Democratic Action,
 2, 7, 12, 20, 33, 36, 51, 52, 55,
 61
 "Analysis Of Testimony Of Witnesses
 In Proceedings Relative to Com-
 munism", 1, 5, 11, 15, 18, 32, 37
 Andrews, T. Coleman, 43, 60, 90
 "Are Subversives Really Subversive",
 101
 Arkansas GAZETTE, 60, 103
 Army-McCarthy investigation, 34
 Arnold, Thurman, 78
 Ashmore, Harry S., 60, 103
 Atlantic Union, 61
 Atom bomb, 15
 Atomic Energy Commission, 8, 10

B

Balabanoff, Angelica, 108
 "Banned Books", 7
 Barth, Alan, 8
 Behavioral sciences, 67, 72
 Bell, Laird, 34
 Bentley, Elizabeth, 1, 3, 4, 18, 34
 Bentley, Richard, 99
 Berrelson, Bernard, 80, 81
 Bibliography, see "Study Of The
 Communist Record, including
 Bibliography, Digest and Micro-
 film"
 Bill of Rights, 41, 100
 Blacklisting, 11, 19, 42, 68, 102
 Block, Herbert, 9, 11, 51-53, 88
 Bonsal, Dudley B., 99
 Bontecou, Eleanor, 42, 43
 Book censorship, 8, 10
 Braden, Spruille, 16
 Bradley, Frederick M., 99
 Breakstone, Irving, 22-24, 26-28
 Bricker amendment, 61
 Bricker, John, Senator, 88, 95, 96
 Browder, Earl, 49, 92, 93, 96
 Brown, Constantine, 82
 Brown University, 107
 Brownell, Herbert, Attorney-
 General, 15, 69-71, 97
 Broyles Committee, 27, 34, 36
 Budenz, Louis, 1, 3, 4, 18, 34
 BULLETIN OF ATOMIC SCIEN-
 TISTS, 7, 8, 72, 74
 Burdette, Winston, 87
 Bureau of Internal Revenue, 4, 12,
 30, 37, 43, 61, 65, 85, 88, 90,
 91, 95
 Burger, William, 80
 Bush, Vannevar, 9

C

Cain, Harry P., 8
 California State Senate Committee
 on Education, 14
 Cantrill, Hadley, 17
 Carnegie Foundation, 33

Carrie Chapman Catt Memorial Fund, 21
 Cartoonist ("Herblock"), 9, 11, 51-53, 87, 88
 Case, Adelaide, 2
 Case, Clifford, Senator, 2, 4
 "Case Studies in Personnel Security", 5, 10, 61
 Catholic University, 97
 CATHOLIC WORKER, 65
 Celler, Emanuel, Rep., 72, 86
 Censorship, see Book censorship
 Chambers, Whittaker, 4, 17, 18, 34
 Chandler, Stephen S., Judge, 83
 Chase, Elba, 45
 Cheatham, Elliot, 99
 Churches, 22, 31, 32, 38
 CIO NEWS, 88
 CIO Political Action Committee, 7, 9, 20, 33, 36, 44, 46, 56, 58, 62, 74, 89
 CITIZEN NEWS, 49
 Civil liberties, 1, 5, 8, 9, 20-22, 31, 32, 40, 42, 46, 49, 67, 73, 75, 88, 100, 107; see also American Civil Liberties Union
 Clamage, Edward, 23, 24, 27
 Clark, Tom, Supreme Court Justice, 83
 Collins, Seaborn, 40-42, 50, 75, 88
 Columbia University, 21, 99
 Committee For An Effective Congress 34
 Committee for the Protection of the American Heritage, see American Heritage Council
 Communism, 1, 2, 5, 11, 13, 15, 18, 24, 26, 32, 40, 41, 49, 59, 67, 73, 76, 82, 88, 92, 93, 102, 107, 108
 Communist Plain Political Association, 49
 Communist influence in American life, 49, 92, 93, 107
 Communist record, 106, 107
 Conformism, 14, 65, 66
 Congressional investigations, 2, 28, 58, 59, 72, 73, 95, 96, 102
 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 54, 55, 78, 103
 Conscientious objectors, 63-66

Constitution, 20, 23, 26, 29, 42
 Cornell University, 8, 21, 31, 39, 75, 92, 107
 Council for Social Action, 22, 31
 Council of American-Soviet Friendship, 81
 COUNTERATTACK, 19
 Cowger, Robert, 78
 Cowles, John, 86
 Cox-Reece Committee on tax exemption, 27
 Crouch, Paul, 1, 4, 18
 Cushman, Robert E., 21, 22, 31

D

DAILY WORKER, 13, 14, 72, 81, 89, 92
 "Darkness at Noon", 108
 Dartmouth College, 16, 44, 45
 Daughters of the American Revolution, 47
 David, Donald K., 94
 Day, Dorothy, 65
 Dean, Arthur H., 99, 100, 103
 Declaration of Independence, 20, 23, 26, 29, 41, 42
 Democratic Party, 7
 Department of Justice, 69, 71, 81, 97
 Des Moines REGISTER & TRIBUNE, 86
 Detroit TIMES, 7, 43
 Dickey, John S., 45
 Dies Investigating Committee, 34
 Douglas, Paul, Senator, 34
 Draper, Theodore, 92
 Duggan, Lawrence, 16
 Duran, Gustavo, 16, 37

E

Earl Newsom & Company, 44, 45
 Eastland, James, Senator, 69, 78-80, 85, 97
 Efnor, Claude, 103, 104, 106
 Eisenhower, Dwight D., President, 34, 37, 57, 62, 89, 97
 English Speaking Union, 34
 Espionage, 15, 48

Extremist groups, 21, 46, 59, 60

F

"Faceless Informers and our Schools", 8, 75
Fahy, Mr., 17
Fairman, Charles, 108
Farmer, William E., 71, 78
"Fear in Education", 11, 66
Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1, 11, 15, 28, 41, 87, 101
Federal judges, 8, 54, 55, 68, 76, 82, 102, 103
Ferry, Hugh, 7, 36
Ferry, W. H., 3, 4, 6, 7, 12, 29, 35-37, 43-45, 48-51, 53, 56, 58, 59, 62, 74, 87, 89, 90, 93, 106
Fifth amendment, 8, 15, 19, 34, 44, 46, 49, 68, 87
Finley, Moses, 36
FIRING LINE, The, 19
Flanders, Ralph, Senator, 34
Flood relief, 89, 90
"For America", (group), 61
Ford, Benson, 94
Ford, Edsel, 2, 30, 60, 65, 66, 90
Ford Foundation - Stockholdings, 30, 31, 66, 95
Ford, Henry, 2, 30, 36, 60, 65, 66, 90
Ford, Henry II, 36, 44, 45, 93, 94, 98-100
Ford Motor Company, 7, 29, 30, 87, 90, 94, 95
Fortas, Abe, 78
Foster, William Z., 96
Freedom Agenda, 21, 32
Freedom Award speeches, 8
Freedom of conscience, 20, 63-66
Freedom of speech, 14, 58, 66
Freedom of thought, 14, 58, 66
Freedom to publish, 31
Freedom to read, 21, 31
Freedom Train, 24, 27
Freeman, David F., 3, 4, 6
Friendly, Henry J., 99
Friends, see American Friends Service Committee, and Quakers, Plymouth Meeting, (Society of Friends)

Fund for the Republic, Inc., Annual report, distribution of, 50, 53

G

Georgetown University, 10, 11, 97, 108
Godwin, Earl, 82
Goldsmith, William M., 103
"Government by Investigation", 8, 75
Government Printing Office, 55
"Grand Inquest", 75
Great Books, 14
Green, Herold T., 57, 77, 78
Griswold, Irwin N., 8
Guilt by association, 42, 59

H

Haight, Anne Lyon, 7
Harkness, Richard and Gladys, 98
Hartmann, Robert, 67
Harvard University, 9, 54, 94, 107, 108
Harvey, Paul, 82
Hennacy, Ammon, 65
Hennings Committee, 42
"Herblock", see Block, Herbert
Heritage Foundation, 23, 26, 27, 29
Hill, Delmas C., 68, 76, 79, 81, 86
Hillings, Patrick J., Senator, 85
Hillman, Sidney, 7, 12, 44, 58, 89
Hiss, Alger, 11, 16, 17, 34, 37
"History of the Communist Party in the U.S., 1919-1945", 92
Hodes, Barnett, 25-27, 29
Hoffman, Paul, 2-4, 9, 26, 29, 36, 57, 60, 62, 100
Hoffman, Hallock, 62
Hoffstadter, Richard, 9
Hospital Administrators Meeting (Atlantic City), see American College of Hospital Administrators
House Judiciary Committee, 82, 85, 86
House UnAmerican Activities Committee, 17, 52
Housing, 8, 51, 52

"How About Those Security Cases", 98
"How Jurors Think", 81
Hull, Cordell, 16
Humphrey, Hubert, Senator, 56, 57,
77, 78, 103
Hutchins, Robert M., 2, 4, 6, 7, 9,
12-15, 18, 20, 22, 25-29, 34-37, 40-
44, 46-51, 53-55, 58, 59, 62-65, 67,
68, 70, 72-76, 79, 81, 88, 90, 92, 95,
99-101, 106, 107
Hysteria, 9, 15, 88

I

"I Accuse", 72
Illinois State Legislature, 13
ILO (International Labor Organization)
44
India, 12, 18, 39, 40, 89
Institute of Pacific Relations, 12, 16,
36, 85

J

Jenner, William, Senator, 48, 78, 79,
82, 85
Jessup, Phillip, 18
Johnson, Manning, 1
Judges, see Federal judges
Jury study, 67-73, 75-80, 82-87, 90,
97
Justice in the military courts, 97

K

Kalven, Harry, Jr., 67, 68, 71-73,
78-81
Keating, Kenneth, Rep., 75, 85
Kennedy, Harold M., 99
"Kept Witnesses, The", 9
"Key To Peace", 24, 29
Kitch, Paul, 67, 78, 82, 83
Knowles, Mary, 46-49
Koestler, Arthur, 108
Krash, Abe, 77, 78

L

Landman, Amos, 87
Lattimore, Owen, 85

"Leading Question, The", 101
Leland Stanford University, 1, 3,
4-6, 10, 11, 15, 16, 18, 32,
34, 35, 37, 40, 53, 107
Lemann, Monte M., 99
Leonhard, Al, 28
Letters, 4, 36, 42, 45, 61, 76-78,
81, 93, 94, 98-102
Levi, Edward H., 67, 72, 73, 79-
82, 86, 97
Lewis, Fulton, jr., 82, 88, 108
Libel, 98-101
Librarian, 46-49
Libraries, 8, 10, 29, 32, 46-48,
64
Los Angeles TIMES, 67, 82
Loyalty-Security, 2, 5, 7-11, 13,
14, 18, 21, 40, 42, 43, 46, 47,
52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 61, 67, 72,
74, 75, 77, 78, 98-103
Lybrand, Ross Brothers & Mont-
gomery, 90, 91

M

MacDonald, Dwight, 108
Magnuson, Warren, Senator, 95
Malin, Patrick Murphy, 71
Manion, Clarence E., 23, 29, 61
Marshall, Charles, 28
Martin, Lawrence, 8
Mikva, Abner Joseph, 67, 78, 83
Miller, Robert T., 17
Millis, Walter, 101
Morris, Robert, Judge, 101
Mundt, Karl, Senator, 17
Murphy, Ray, 82
Murrow, Edward R., 8, 10
McCarran-Walter Internal Security
program, 52
McCarthy, Joseph R., Senator,
16, 57
McDonald vs. Pless, 70
McLain, John, 45

N

National Lawyers' Guild, 81
New Hampshire Sunday NEWS, 45
NEW LEADER, 107

New York HERALD-TRIBUNE, 101
New York JOURNAL AMERICAN, 99
New York TIMES, 9, 108
Nixon, Richard M., Vice President,
17
Non-conformism, 59, 63-66
NORTHWEST INDUSTRIAL NEWS,
103
Northwestern University, 16, 37
Notre Dame University, 24, 29, 61

O

O'Melveny, John, 99
OPA, 43, 44, 78
Oppenheimer, J. Robert, 8, 10, 72,
74, 75
Oxford University, 16
Oxnam, G. Bromley, Bishop, 32

P

Packer, Herbert, 3, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15,
18, 35, 53, 54
Parker, John J., Judge, 82
PEOPLES' DAILY WORLD, 14, 15
Philbrick, Herbert A., 46, 48
Phillips, Orrie, Judge, 79
Picket, Clarence, 62
Porter, Paul, 78
Post Office Department, 9
"Prejudice and the Press", 36
Pressman, Lee, 44, 51, 56, 58, 89
"Pseudo Conservative Revolt, The",
9

Q

Quakers, Plymouth Meeting (Society
of Friends), 46-48
Questionnaires, 19, 20, 66, 103,
104, 105

R

Racht, Leon, 99
Radio-Television, 8, 10, 11, 19-21,
32, 46, 51, 87, 95, 96
RED CHANNELS, 19

"Red" Dean of Canterbury", 81
Remington, William, 11, 44, 45,
51, 89
"Report on the Security Problem",
54-57
Resister's League, 65
Richardson, Mark E., 90, 91
Riesel, Victor, 49, 82
Roberts, George, 99
Roche, Jeffrey, 99
Rockefeller, Nelson, 16, 17, 37
Roelofs, H. Mark, 21, 31
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 34
Rosenberg, Ethel and Julius, 72,
77, 81
Rossiter, Clinton, 92, 93, 107,
108
Rovere, Richard H., 9
Roy, Ralph Lord, 76
Rubin, Victor, 24-27
Russia, 9, 15, 39

S

Samuel Adams School, 46
San Francisco NEWS, 18
Savage, Roy, Judge, 83
Scholarships, 16, 33, 34
Schools, 8, 31, 64, 75
Spying, see Espionage
Scripps-Howard newspapers, 92,
93, 107
Sears-Roebuck Foundation, 33, 61
Security, see Loyalty-Security
"See It Now", 8
Senate Internal Security Subcom-
mittee, 46, 48, 69, 73, 78, 82-
85, 87, 93, 101
Senate Interstate Commerce Com-
mittee, 95
Sessions, John A., 107, 108
Seymour, Whitney North, 99
Smart, Ann, 8
Smith Act, 14, 41
Snee, Joseph M., Reverend, 108
Sobelov, Simon E., 83
Sokolsky, George, 76, 82
Sons of the American Revolution, 76
Sourwine, Jay, 48, 69, 80, 81

Southern Regional Council, 32
Spaeth, Carl B., 6, 11, 12, 15-
18, 35, 37, 40, 54

Sproul, Dr., 13

STANFORD LAW REVIEW, 5, 32

Stanford University, see Leland

Stanford University

Stanley, Eugene, 79

State Department, 16, 17

Stevenson, Adlai, 16, 17, 34, 60

Stevenson, Eleanor B., 47

Strodebeck, Fred, 67, 78, 83

"Strong in Their Pride and Free", 8

"Study of Communist Influence in
American Life", 49, 92, 107

"Study of the Communist Record,
including Bibliography, Digest, and
Microfilm", 106, 107

Subversion, 13, 18, 41, 48, 59, 82

Summerfield, Arthur, Postmaster

General, 9

Supreme Court, 14, 41, 70

Sutherland, Arthur E., 107, 108

T

Taft, Phillip, 107

Taylor, Telford, 75

Teachers, 11, 33, 34, 90

Telegrams, 23

Television, see Radio-Television

Templar, George, 71, 78

Temple University, 16

TIME, Inc., 33, 44

Treasury Department, 12, 42

Trials, 64

Turner, C. Russell, jr., 78

U

Ummecke, Wilbur C., 25

UNESCO, 82

United Nations, 17, 34, 37

University of California, 13

University of Chicago, 2, 6, 12-14,
22, 25-27, 34, 36, 43, 55, 67,
68, 70-73, 75, 76, 78-83, 86, 87,
90, 97

University of Idaho, 73

University of Minnesota, 103, 104
University of Southern Calif-
ornia, 13

W

Wallace, William R., Judge, 83

Washington POST & TIMES-HER-
ALD, 9, 14, 51, 77, 88

Washington University, 108

Welles, Sumner, 16

"Who Are The Lunatics", 103

Willen, Paul, 9

Wire-tapping, 68, 71, 77

Woltman, Frederick, 107

Wood, Robert E., General, 61

Wright, James, 16

Wyman, Louis, 45

Y

Yale University, 15-37

Yarmolinsky, Adam, 57, 61,
75, 102

YMCA, 32

YWCA, 32

PRINTED IN
WASHINGTON, D. C.
BY THE
NATIONAL PUBLISHING COMPANY